DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 300 RC 008 974

AUTHOR	Wilber, George L.; Hagan, Robert J.
TITLE	Metropolitan and Regional Inequalities Among Minorities in the Labor Market. Volume 3. Minorities in the Labor Market.
INSTITUTION	Kentucky Univ., Lexington. Social Welfare Research Inst.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	DLMA-21-21-74-08-3
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	150p.; For related documents, see Vol 1, ED 113 118 and Vol 2, ED 115 723
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; American Indians; Asian Americans; Comparative Analysis; *Employment Statistics; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Ethnic Groups; *Labor Market; Negroes; Occupational Mobility; Qualifications; Socioeconomic Status; *Spanish Culture; Unemployment; Urban Areas; Wages

ABSTRACT

Inequalities among minorities in the labor market were examined. Minorities were classified according to persons of Spanish descent (Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans), Blacks, American Indians, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos. All persons 20 to 64 years of age, not enrolled in school and not living in group quarters, who were residents in 1970 were included. Detailed information was provided via the tabulations for regions and metropolitan areas. Emphasis was placed on labor force participation, employment, occupational achievement, mobility, weeks worked, and earnings. Brief profiles of each minority summarized their achievements. Data were obtained from the United States census' Public Use Sample files for 1970. Comparisons indicated that: (1) levels of employment, occupational achievement, and earnings differed by location, but that the overall rankings of minorities were not modified within areas; (2) participation and achievement levels tended to be highest in areas where a minority was must numerous, except for Cubans in Miami; and (3) achievements of minorities in the labor market were more dependent on their minority characteristics and such determinants as their educational attainment than on their regional or metropolitan location. (NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED118300

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

METROPOLITAN AND REGIONAL INEQUALITIES AMONG MINORITIES IN THE LABOR MARKET

Minorities in the Labor Market

VOLUME III
1975

George L. Wilber
Robert J. Hagan

Social Welfare Research Institute
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

This report was prepared for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development grant No. 21-21-74-08. Since grantees conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The grantee is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

RC 008 974

CONTENTS

PREFACE

NOTATIONS

LIST OF DETAILED TABLES

PROFILES OF PARTICIPATION AND ACHIEVEMENT

APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

APPENDIX B: APPENDIX TABLES

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. Report No. 21-21-74-08-3

2.

3. Recipient's Accession No.

4. Title and Subtitle
Minorities in the Labor Market. Volume III, Metropolitan and Regional Inequalities Among Minorities in the Labor Market

5. Report Date 1/30/76

6.

7. Author(s)
George L. Wilber and Robert J. Hagan

8. Performing Organization Rept. No.

9. Performing Organization Name and Address
Social Welfare Research Institute
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No.
DL 21-21-74-08

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address
U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration
Office of Research and Development
601 D Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20213

13. Type of Report & Period Covered

14. Final

15. Supplementary Notes

16. Abstracts

Comparisons of color-ethnic minorities in major regions and metropolitan areas in the U.S. indicate that (1) levels of employment, occupational achievement and earnings differ by location, but that the overall rankings of minorities are not modified within areas, (2) levels of participation and achievement tend to be highest in areas where a minority is most numerous, one exception being Cubans in Miami, and (3) achievements of minorities in the labor market are more dependent of their minority characteristics and such determinants as their educational attainment than on their regional or metropolitan location. This report provides detailed data from the 1970 census for persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban descent and for Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos in this country, as well as for American Indians and blacks.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors
Earnings, Education, Employment, Ethnic Groups, Females, Males, Manpower, Mobility, Qualifications, Socioeconomic status, Statistical Analysis, Statistical samples, Unemployment, Urban areas

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms
Inequality, Discrimination, Mexicans, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Blacks, Public Use Sample from U.S. 1970 census, Occupational Achievement Index, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

17c. COSATI Field/Group 5. K.

18. Availability Statement **Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.**

19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED

20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED

21. No. of Pages 152

22. Price

FORM NTIS-35 (REV. 3-72)

THIS FORM MAY BE REPRODUCED

USCOMM-DC 14952-P72

PREFACE

Intergroup inequalities and discrimination were examined at the national level in Minorities in the Labor Market, Volume I, Spanish Americans and Indians in the Labor Market, and Volume II, Orientals in the Labor Market. This volume presents similar data for regions and metropolitan areas, and is intended to serve as a convenient and valuable reference since detailed information of this kind has not been available before.

The scope and organization of materials in this report differ from the previous reports. While attention continues to be concentrated on labor force participation, employment, occupational achievement, mobility and earnings of minorities, detailed information is provided via the tabulations for regions and metropolitan areas. Too few Koreans were in the sample files for these purposes and they have not been included. Information on American Indians is confined to the major regions since relatively few Indians were resident in metropolitan areas in 1970. Comparable information for whites is not included, partly for practical reasons of costs and partly on the grounds that much of this kind of information for whites can be gleaned from census and other sources.

Although this volume was intended originally as a "data book," achievements of minorities are summarized in brief profiles of each of eight color-ethnic minorities. Readers, however, may wish to compare different minorities within a region or metropolitan area, and this can be done without undue effort. Emphasis is placed on their labor force participation, employment, occupational achievement, mobility, weeks worked and earnings. Much greater detail is contained in the tables which follow (Tables 1-12), but this summary, accompanied by relatively brief tables, should facilitate a grasp of essential patterns of similarities and differences within a minority among regions and metropolitan areas.

In an attempt to distill some of the more important information from Tables 1-12, the summary tables (Tables A-H) concentrate on those regions and metropolitan areas in which relatively large numbers of each minority are concentrated. Because minority populations themselves are not uniformly distributed across the country, this means that the summary tables do not cover identical regions and metropolitan areas (SMSA's) for each minority. Those interested in a particular region or metropolitan area therefore may need to rely on the detailed tables.

Alternative ways of summarizing and synthesizing this rather massive data were considered. Information might have been presented separately for each region and metropolitan area, but not all populations are adequately represented in each area. Alternatively, information might have been organized consistent with the topical areas--labor force participation, employment, etc. The decision to organize the statistical information separately for each minority groups was based on the expectation that interest would be strongest concerning a particular minority.

Appendix A presents technical descriptions of the sample populations, identifies the regions and metropolitan areas and defines the major variables and measures employed in this report. Readers may find it worthwhile to consult this appendix at the outset.

Appendix B adds information gained from published census reports, which serves to supplement the data obtained from the Public Use Samples.

NOTATIONS

PUS	Public Use Sample
LFP	Labor force participation
LFPR	Labor force participation rate
NILF	Not in labor force
ER	Employment rate
OCC70	Occupation score, 1970
OCC65	Occupation score, 1965
SMSA	Standard metropolitan statistical area
*	Asterisk identifies values in tables where base sample frequencies are low, as described in Appendix A
---	Estimated values not shown because of small frequencies in PUS samples
M	Male
F	Female

See Appendix A for descriptions

POPULATIONS* IN THIS REPORT

Spanish descent:
- **Mexican**
- **Puerto Rican**
- **Cuban**

Race or color:
- **White**
- **Black**
- **Indian**
- **Japanese**
- **Chinese**
- **Filipino**

*** Samples include all persons 20-64 years of age, not enrolled in school and not living in group quarters, who were resident in the United States in 1970. Persons of Spanish descent are not included in the race or color categories to avoid double counts.**

TABLES[*]

1. LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES, BY REGION, SMSA, SEX AND AGE, 1970

2. LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES, BY REGION, SMSA, EDUCATION AND SEX, 1970

3. EMPLOYMENT RATES, BY REGION, SMSA. AGE AND SEX, 1970

4. EMPLOYMENT RATES, BY REGION, SMSA. EDUCATION AND SEX, 1970

5. OCCUPATION, BY REGION, SMSA AND SEX, 1970

6. MEAN OCCUPATION SCORES, BY REGION, SMSA, SEX AND AGE, 1970

7. MEAN OCCUPATION SCORES, BY REGION, SMSA, SEX AND EDUCATION, 1970

8. OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, BY REGION, SMSA AND SEX, 1965-70

9. EARNINGS IN 1969, BY REGION, SMSA, AGE AND SEX

10. EARNINGS IN 1969, BY REGION, SMSA, EDUCATION AND SEX

11. WEEKS WORKED AND EARNINGS IN 1969, BY REGION, SMSA AND SEX

12. EMPLOYMENT IN SELECTED INDUSTRIES, REGIONS, AND SMSA, BY SEX, 1970

---

[*] Each table is divided into eight parts, one for each minority population.

MEXICANS

Largest of the three Spanish origin populations, Mexicans have settled primarily in the Southwest and along the West coast. There are sizeable numbers of Mexicans in six of the DOL regions, and also in eighteen SMSA's. Eight of these SMSA's are in California, seven in Texas and two in Arizona. Chicago is the easternmost SMSA with a sizeable Mexican population. This pattern provides a clear indication that Mexicans are urban dwellers, despite their relatively heavy employment in agricultural occupations.

The labor force participation of Mexican men is comparatively high whereas Mexican women are well below other women in this respect. In 1970, 87% of all Mexican men in the study population were in the labor force, and their LFPR's in Regions 5-10 exceeded this level, as shown in Table A. Among the major SMSA's, their LFPR's fell below this level only in Brownsville, Laredo and Fresno. Their highest participation rates occur in Houston, Anaheim, Oxnard, and San Bernardino. Only 39% of all Mexican women were in the labor force in 1970, and those in Regions 6, 8 and 10 were below this level. In Tucson only 29% of the Mexican women were active in the labor force in contrast with a LFPR of 50% in San Francisco. Mexican women were also relatively inactive in Corpus Christi, Laredo and Fresno.

Employment rates for Mexicans are generally low, at about the same levels as Puerto Ricans and blacks, but higher than for American Indians. ER's for Mexican men and women were comparatively low in Regions 8 and 10 and high in Regions 5 and 6. With the exceptions of Fresno, San Francisco and Oxnard, employment rates for Mexican men were at or above their own national average in the SMSA's. ER's for women fell below their national average in San Diego, Anaheim, Fresno, San Francisco and San Jose.

Average levels of occupational achievement for Mexicans were among the lowest. In Region 10 Mexican men's achievement averaged only 24, barely higher than the national average of 21 for Mexican women. Mexican men in Fresno, however, averaged even lower with an average occupation score of 23. The highest levels of occupational achievement for Mexican men are found in Region 7 and in San Antonio, El Paso, and San Jose, but in none of these places did their achievements reach the national averages of white, Oriental or Cuban men. Mexican women's average occupation scores of 21 were the lowest among eight color-ethnic groups in this report, and among the six regions they bettered their own national average only in Region 5. Their average scores were below 20 in six of the SMSA's, and their highest average achievements were only 24 (in Chicago and San Francisco).

Occupational mobility of Mexican workers between 1965 and 1970 does not contribute greatly toward improved occupational status. About 38-39% of Mexican workers changed jobs during this period, roughly at about the same rates as white workers, and slightly more than half of this mobility was upward for Mexican men, while only half of the mobility of Mexican women was upward in the occupational structure. Mexican men were most job-mobile in Region 8 and least mobile in Regions 6 and 9. Mexican men in Oxnard were not only relatively nonmobile, but also were among the lowest on the occupational achievement scale. Mexican women were most mobile in Region 5 and in Dallas, Phoenix, Tucson, Anaheim, Fresno and San Jose. However, in only three locations were as many as half of the Mexican women upwardly mobile (in San Antonio, Brownsville and Corpus Christi). This means, of course that occupational mobility is mostly downward for Mexican women, and downward from already low occupational levels.

About three-fourths of Mexican men but fewer than half of Mexican women worked a full 48-52 week year in 1969. Rates of full-year employment were higher in Regions 5-7 than in Regions 8-9. Mexican men were least likely to be employed on a full-year basis in Brownsville, Laredo, and Fresno, whereas their chances were far greater in Houston, San Antonio, Corpus Christi, El Paso and Tucson. Fewer than half of employed Mexican women worked a full year in four of the six regions and in 12 of the eighteen SMSA's.

The median earnings of $5,757 in 1969 for Mexican men ranks them below white and Cuban men, and at about the same level as Puerto Ricans, but higher than black and Indian men. On the other hand, Mexican women averaged only $2,747, the lowest average earnings of all groups. Earnings were highest in Regions 5, 7 and 9 for Mexican men, where at least 80% earned $3,500 or more in 1969. In only seven of the SMSA's did Mexican men show as many as 80% with earnings of $3,500 or more. Mexican women fared much worse. Only in Region 5 did as many as half earn $3,500 or more, and there were only three SMSA's in which half earned this much (in Chicago, San Francisco and San Jose). Earnings were appreciably higher for Mexican men who worked a full 48-52 week year. Still, fewer than 80% had earnings of $3,500 or more in two regions and in five SMSA's. In Laredo only 49% and in Brownsville only 56% of the Mexican men had earnings this high even though they worked a full year.

Table A. Achievements of Mexicans in Major Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970

Characteristic and sex[a]	Region						SMSA		
	5	6	7	8	9	10	Chicago	Los Angeles	Dallas
LFPR: M	95	90	90	88	91	90	93	92	91
F	44	37	44	35	41	37	45	44	43
ER: M	96	96	94	94	93	88	97	94	98
F	97	94	90	91	90	90	95	93	91
Pct. worked 48-52 weeks: M	78	79	82	77	73	63	78	75	79
F	49	51	55	42	43	28	54	51	44
Occupation score: M	33	33	36	32	32	24	35	34	32
F	24	19	20	20	20	16	24	22	20
Pct. mobile: M	42	38	34	53	38	43	43	38	44
F	44	38	38	42	37	28*	38	35	46
Pct. upward: M	60	59	61	54	60	58	61	56	57
F	66	47	50*	36*	52	---	48	57	38*
Pct. w/earnings of $3500 or more: M	82	63	84	73	80	64	86	81	75
F	55	28	34	37	43	15	59	49	42
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	90	70	88	85	88	79	94	90	86
F	76	41	51	67	66	---	79	68	75*

[a] See page v for notations.

Table A. (Continued)

Characteristic and sex[a]		Houston	San Antonio	Brownsville	Corpus Christi	Laredo	El Paso	Phoenix
LFPR:	M	95	91	84	90	83	90	90
	F	39	41	38	33	31	41	38
ER	M	98	96	94	97	94	97	97
	F	97	91	93	93	93	96	94
Pct. worked 48-52 weeks:	M	83	82	70	82	64	85	79
	F	48	52	43	53	52	58	36
Occupation score:	M	34	37	30	34	30	37	31
	F	22	22	19	18	22	18	18
Pct. mobile:	M	44	38	40	39	37	35	42
	F	41	34	32	31	36	23	53
Pct. Upward	M	64	56	55	50	57	55	73
	F	39	51	51	54	43*	32	---
Pct. w/ earnings of $3,500 or more								
	M	78	76	47	64	41	77	72
	F	37	40	15	20	30	32	32
Worked 48-52 weeks:	M	88	82	56	74	49	82	79
	F	59	54	23	35	43	40	55

Table A. (Continued)

Characteristic and sex[a]	Tucson	San Diego	Anaheim	Fresno	Oxnard	San Bernandino	San Francisco	San Jose
LFPR: M	92	92	94	83	96	97	92	91
F	29	41	40	30	37	38	50	38
ER: M	96	94	97	90	93	96	92	94
F	92	90	89	74	91	91	90	85
Pct. worked 48-52 weeks: M	82	76	78	61	75	76	71	75
F	41	48	38	25	26	41	49	35
Occupation score: M	34	33	35	23	30	31	33	36
F	29	29	22	14	17	20	24	21
Pct. mobile: M	38	40	38	33	32	39	42	44
F	44	28	45	44	32	30	38	45
Pct. upward: M	67*	65	68	64	58*	57	59	69
F	---	---	48*	38*	---	48*	40	38*
Pct. w/earnings of $3500 or more								
M	82	74	85	58	74	80	83	84
F	36	39	33	31	38	40	60	50
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	89	81	92	66	83	87	89	91
F	67	64	56	---	---	58	83	71

Three-fourths of the Mexican women reached the $3,500 level in Region 5, but only 41% in Region 6 among the full-year workers. Earnings of fully-employed Mexican women were highest in San Francisco and Chicago. In sharp contrast, only about a fourth the fully-employed Mexican women in Brownsville earned this much. Hence, a substantial number of Mexican women who worked a full year received extremely low monetary rewards.

PUERTO RICANS

Puerto Ricans have settled in the eastern half of the nation, primarily along the east coast. In addition to the six regions in which they are most heavily concentrated, there are six SMSA's serving as major habitats for Puerto Ricans in the United States. As citizens of the U.S., Puerto Ricans can move with relative freedom between Puerto Rico and the mainland. A large proportion of Puerto Ricans live in the New York-Newark-Jersey City metropolitan areas and are employed mostly in blue-collar and service occupations.

Labor force participation appears to be low in areas of heaviest concentration of Puerto Ricans. As shown in Table B, only 86% of Puerto Rican men and 32% of Puerto Rican women in Region 2 were in the labor force in 1970, and in the New York SMSA comparable figures were 83% and 30%. Variations occur however, as in Newark where 94% of Puerto Rican men were in the labor force and only 30% of Puerto Rican women.

Employment rates in 1970 were generally at about the same levels as for other Spanish origin and black workers, i.e., lower than white employment rates. In Region 5 and in Jersey City, Newark, Philadelphia and Los Angeles employment rates for women were under 90%.

The average level of occupational achievement for Puerto Rican men was one of the lowest (about equal to the levels of Mexicans and blacks), and Puerto Rican women shared with other Spanish, and black women an occupational status well below the level of white women. In Region 9 and in Los Angeles, Puerto Ricans averaged slightly higher achievement levels, whereas in New York they were below the Puerto Rican national averages.

Neither the incidence nor the direction of occupational mobility promises much improvement in the occupational standing of Puerto Ricans. Men were more mobile than women and there are indications of success in the upward mobility of Puerto Rican men, since more than half of the mobile men moved upward. In none of the regions or SMSA's did as many as half of the Puerto Rican women move upward.

Table B. Achievements of Puerto Ricans in Major Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970

Characteristic and sex[a]	Region 1	2	3	4	5	9
LFPR: M	91	86	91	90	91	87
F	37	32	46	48	41	48
ER: M	93	95	95	97	95	92
F	96	91	100	94	89	96
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:						
M	76	78	81	75	79	79
F	43	48	63	48	50	49
Occupation score:						
M	32	31	29	33	30	36
F	23	22	22	24	27	24
Percent mobile:						
M	63	39	37	39	42	44
F	48*	32	40	43*	44	35
Percent upward mobility:						
M	63	54	64*	91*	60	60
F	---	48	39*	---	46	---
Percent with earnings of more than $3,500:						
M	72	79	73	66	84	81
F	34	60	56	35	48	52
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	78	88	80	80	90	85
F	---	77	76	---	71	81

Table B. (Continued)

Characteristic and sex[a]	New York	Jersey City	Newark	Philadelphia	Chicago	Los Angeles
LFPR: M	83	91	94	86	96	81
F	30	35	30	29	43	44
ER: M	96	96	98	92	94	94
F	94	88	86	88	92	87
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:						
M	78	68	76	70	83	71
F	58	30	---	47*	57	44*
Occupation score:						
M	31	27	34	32	30	35
F	21	19	20	21	23	27
Percent mobile:						
M	38	32	32	47	51	38
F	30	---	---	31*	40	19*
Percent upward mobility: M	54	---	---	67*	52	---
F	46	---	---	---	24*	---
Percent with earnings of more than $3,500:						
M	81	75	84	69	82	94
F	56	50*	50*	---	51	---
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	87	83	89	82	86	93*
F	74	---	---	---	62	---

---

[a] See page v for notations.

About the same proportion of Puerto Rican as Mexican men were employed for 48-52 weeks in 1969, but Puerto Rican women were more likely than Mexicans to be employed a full year. Puerto Rican men and women in Regions 1 and 4 were slightly less likely to have a full year of work and they also fell below average in Jersey City.

The average earnings of Puerto Rican women in 1969 ($3,720) were remarkably high in view of their occupational status and lack of full-year employment. While Puerto Rican women's earnings were nearly as high as white women's, Puerto Rican men averaged about $1,600 less than white men. In Regions 1 and 4 barely a third of Puerto Rican women earned $3,500 or more in 1969. In Region 2 and in New York more than half had earnings this high. Puerto Rican men in Los Angeles averaged the highest earnings, with 94% earning $3,500 or more. Only 66% of the men in Region 4 and 69% in Philadelphia received this much. Among those employed for the full year in 1969, the earnings of men in Philadelphia and Jersey City were still comparatively low.

CUBANS

The majority of Cubans in the United States came as refugees from the Castro regime. They have benefited from special provisions of the refugee program, such as relocation allowances and training program for Cuban refugees. Despite what must have been a traumatic experience for many, Cuban refugees have adapted well in many ways, as indicated by their relative absence from public assistance and their records of employment and earnings. Miami continues to be a primary settlement location, although the New York-New Jersey area is heavily populated by Cubans. The resettlement program has helped in the growth of Cubans populations in Chicago and Los Angeles.

Cuban men and women record some of the highest LFPR's in the nation, and their employment rates too are exceptionally high, as shown in Table C. Interestingly, Cuban LFPR's are higher in Chicago than in Miami, although Cuban women are least active in the labor force in New York. The highest unemployment rates for Cuban women in 1970 were in Jersey City, and for men in Los Angeles.

The national average level of occupational achievement for Cuban men was higher than for Mexican, Puerto Rican, Indian and black workers, but Cuban women ranked at about the same level as women in these minorities. Cubans had greater success in Region 5 and in Chicago than in the New York-Jersey City-Newark areas. Cuban women in Miami and Los Angeles averaged the lowest degrees of occupational achievement.

Table C. Achievements of Cubans in Major Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970

Characteristic and sex[a]	Region				SMSA					
	2	4	5	9	New York	Jersey City	Newark	Miami	Chicago	Los Angeles
LFPR: M	95	94	100	94	93	95	88	94	100	97
F	57	59	74	51	55	66	68	61	71	64
ER: M	98	96	90	93	99	94	100	97	100	89
F	90	93	89	89	93	83	97	93	93	90
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:										
M	78	77	75	78	81	81	76	75	82	71
F	55	53	53	58	59	53	53	54	56	42
Occupation score:										
M	35	38	42	35	35	32	34	38	40	37
F	23	20	27	25	24	23	22	20	24	18
Percent mobile:										
M	47	54	66	60	44	56	33*	50	63	59
F	38	37	48	40	35	47	---	35	47*	51
Percent upward mobility:										
M	48	56	43	49	52	51	---	56	46*	54
F	54	41	57	67	43	52*	---	59	---	45*
Percent with earnings of more than $3,500:										
M	80	74	84	82	82	88	84	68	74	78
F	59	42	70	61	64	48	55	38	67	41
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	88	83	90	92	89	96	93	80	88	88
F	81	62	83	76	82	70	79*	53	77	61

[a] See page v for notations.

Cubans are among the most occupationally mobile workers in the nation. Between 1965 and 1970 more than half of Cuban men and 40% of Cuban women changed occupations. This comparatively high incidence of job mobility may be due in part to their recency of immigration and resettlement in this country. This interpretation is consistent with the higher rates of occupational mobility in Regions 5 and 9, and in Chicago and Los Angeles, than in Regions 2 and 4, since the upper midwest and the west coast were not primary areas of initial settlement. About half of the occupational movement of Cubans was upward mobility, and the chances for occupational advancement were greater in Miami than in other SMSA's. As a whole, however, Cuban women in Region 4 were much less upwardly mobile than in other regions.

Cubans were employed for a full 48-52 week year in 1969 at about the same rates as others. Cuban men and women in Los Angeles were below average on full-year employment, and in New York and Jersey City were much more likely to have a full year of work.

Of all those who worked in 1969, about three-fourths of the men and half of the women earned $3,500 or more. Miami, however, with a large concentration of Cubans, shows below average earnings. In Jersey City 88% of Cuban men earned above this level, as compared with only 68% in Miami. In Chicago 67% of Cuban women were above this earnings level, as compared with only 38% in Miami. Even when only those employed for a full year are considered, Cubans in Miami earned less than in other SMSA's.

INDIANS

American Indians are more widely dispersed across the country and less frequently inhabit urban areas than other minorities. There were too few Indians in metropolitan areas to permit tabulations comparable to those for other minorities. With the exceptions of Regions 1 and 3, Indians were present in sufficient numbers in each of the major regions.

The generally low position of Indians in the labor market is reflected in their labor force participation and employment. Three-fourths of Indian men and two-fifths of Indian women in the study population were in the labor force in 1970,as shown in Table D. Their lowest levels of participation occur in Regions 6, 8, 9, and 10 for men and in the first three of these for women. The highest LFPR's for Indian men (83% in Region 4) are about equivalent to the national averages for black and Puerto Rican men. LFPR's for Indian women in Regions 2 and 4 are nearly as high as white women's national average LFPR, but fall well below this level in Regions 6, 8 and 9. With the lowest employment rates of all minorities in 1970 (89%), unemployment was most severe in Region 10, where as many as 20% of all Indian men were unemployed.

Indians fare somewhat better in their occupational achievement than might be expected from their comparatively low LFPR's and ER's. Indian men with an average occupation score of 36, ranked higher than Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and blacks. Among the regions the range of occupation scores for Indian men was only four points, a high of 37 in Region 2 and a low of 33 in Regions 4 and 10. The level of occupational achievement for Indian women also compares favorably with some other women. Their overall occupational level of 24 was as high as the averages for Spanish origin and black women, but perceptibly lower than for white and Oriental women. Their average achievements were highest on Region 2 and lowest in Regions 7 and 9, but even in Region 2 their achievements failed to match the levels reached by Japanese and Filipino women.

Occupational mobility is often more frequent for the more disadvantaged minorities, and this is the case with American Indians. Almost half of the Indians employed in 1965 and 1970 changed jobs by 1970--46% of Indian men and 44% of Indian women. In Regions 7 and 10 more than half of all Indians employed in both years had changed jobs. In Regions 2 and 4 however, only about a fourth were occupationally mobile. The mobility pattern differs for Indian women with their highest incidence of occupational mobility in Region 4 and the lowest in Region 2 and 10. Of those who were occupationally mobile between 1965 and 1970, a majority of Indian men and half of Indian women moved upward in the occupational structure. As many as 68% of the mobile Indian men (in Region 8) were upwardly mobile while only half moved upward in Region 9. Indian women were most successful in their upward mobility in Region 6, whereas 61% moved downward in the occupational structure in Region 9.

Indian workers were less likely than any of the other minorities to work a full year in 1969. Less than half of the Indian women and about 60% of the Indian men worked 48-52 weeks. In Regions 8, 9 and 10 Indian men were the least likely to work a full year, and for Indian women Regions 7, 8 and 10 afforded the least opportunities for full year employment.

The low earnings of American Indians are partly a function of their underemployment and the nature of their employment. In Region 2 two-thirds of the Indian men worked a full year, but only half had earnings of $3,500 or more in 1969. Moreover, only 61% who worked a full year had earnings of $3,500 or more, the lowest level among all the regions. Indian women in Region 2 also experience great difficulties with full-year employment and earnings. Only a fourth of the Indian women in Region 2 received earnings of $3,500 or more, and among those who worked a full year only a third had earnings as high as this. Regions 2 and 5 are more industrialized

Table D. Achievements of Indians in Major Regions, by Sex, 1970

Characteristic and sex[a]	Region 2	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
LFPR: M	81	83	82	72	78	71	71	73
F	45	44	41	38	40	39	37	42
ER: M	90	98	92	92	94	80	89	80
F	93	92	89	92	89	87	89	84
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:								
M	66	67	72	64	68	54	61	51
F	50	44	45	49	32	41	46	32
Occupation score:								
M	37	33	35	35	35	34	34	33
F	28	22	24	22	21	24	21	22
Percent mobile:								
M	25	28	44	47	59	49	46	54
F	35*	51	47	45	---	49	43	39
Percent upward mobility:								
M	---	---	61	65	---	68	50	58
F	---	42*	58*	60	---	58*	39	---
Percent with earnings of more than $3,500:								
M	72	49	74	61	66	56	69	71
F	53	24	44	36	32	35	43	42
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	82	61	82	75	74	71	79	80
F	74	33	64	52	59	61	62	74

---

[a] See page v for notations.

and urbanized and Indians do somewhat better in these regions, as the appreciably higher levels of earnings, especially among the full-year workers, demonstrates.

JAPANESE

Labor force participation rates (LFPR) for Japanese men and women are comparatively high at the national level. In Regions 3 and 8, however, only 80% of Japanese men are in the labor force, and in Regions 2, 3, and 5 fewer than half of Japanese women are in the labor force. At least 90% of Japanese men in four SMSA's--Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Honolulu--are in the labor force. San Francisco shows the lowest LFPR for Japanese women.

Employment rates (ER) for Japanese men and women are also high in comparison with other populations. Almost all Japanese in the labor force in 1970 were employed. Japanese men in Region 3 and women in Regions 3 and 10 showed the lowest employment rates, although with the exception of Japanese women in Los Angeles, employment rates were at or above the 98% level in all four metropolitan areas in 1970.

With overall levels of occupational achievement comparable to those for white men and women, the occupational achievements of Japanese men were above their own national average in Regions 2, 3 and 5, and the same is true for Japanese women in Regions 2 and 5. Japanese women in Chicago averaged well above the national average for Japanese women and appreciably higher than in Los Angeles, San Francisco and Honolulu. The consistency of Japanese levels of occupational achievement is indicated by their averages in each of the major regions and in 3 of the 4 SMSA's.

Japanese workers, especially men, are not highly mobile between occupations, which may be attributed in part to their relatively high occupational achievements. At the national level, no more than a third of Japanese men and women were occupationally mobile between 1965 and 1970. Japanese men in Region 2 and in Chicago were somewhat more mobile than in other locations. Japanese women in Regions 2, 8 and 9 and in Chicago and Honolulu tended to be more occupationally mobile than those living elsewhere. In Region 9 and in Honolulu occupationally mobile Japanese workers show better than average success in their upward mobility.

With the exception of Regions 8 and 10, at least 80% of Japanese men employed in 1969 worked 48-52 weeks, and as many as 88% worked a "full year" in Region 3 and in Honolulu. Nationally about 63% of employed

Table E. Achievements of Japanese in Major Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970

	Region						SMSA			
Characteristic and sex[a]	2	3	5	8	9	10	Chicago	Los Angeles	San Francisco	Honolulu
LFPR: M	92	80	93	80	92	90	90	90	91	92
F	45	36	41	58	62	56	61	60	54	67
ER: M	97	100	99	94	99	98	99	98	98	99
F	96	95	97	98	98	95	100	96	98	98
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:										
M	83	88	80	72	85	78	80	84	81	88
F	62	47	58	59	66	54	59	62	63	72
Occupation score:										
M	56	63	55	41	45	47	45	48	48	45
F	33	29	32	28	30	28	40	30	30	29
Percent mobile:										
M	42	---	29	35*	29	31	35	32	29	25
F	39	---	20	39*	32	43	33*	28	30	37
Percent upward mobility:										
M	---	---	---	---	55	---	---	43	---	62
F	---	---	---	---	46	---	---	40	---	49
Percent with earnings of more than $3,500:										
M	86	92	82	67	77	64	69	70	76	86
F	58	54	63	44	60	54	72	65	58	63
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	92	---	89	77	81	67	78	74	80	90
F	79	---	81	53	72	68	81	79	70	74

[a] See page v for notations.

Japanese women worked a full year in 1969 and this level was exceeded only in Region 9 and in Honolulu.

The proportions of Japanese with earnings from employment of at least $3,500 in 1969 are higher than for most minorities, although in Regions 8 and 10 their average earnings tend to be comparatively low. Among the full-year workers--those who worked at least 48 weeks in 1969--there are noticeable differences in earnings. In Region 10, for example, only 67% of the full-year Japanese men received earnings of $3,500 or more, in contrast with 92% in Region 2. A similar range in earnings occurs for Japanese women, where only 53% in Region 8 compared with 79% in Region 2 had earnings of $3,500 or more. Japanese men in Honolulu and Japanese women in Chicago showed the highest levels of earnings among the four SMSA's.

CHINESE

There are five regions and five SMSA's with substantial numbers of Chinese, as indicated in Table F. The labor force participation of Chinese men is lowest in Regions 1 and 5 and highest in Region 2. LFPR's are relatively low for Chinese women in Regions 1 and 5, and also in Region 2. LFPR's for SMSA's tend to be consistent with the regional pattern, although in Honolulu the LFPR for Chinese men is appreciably higher than in other areas. Chinese women are least likely to be in the labor force in New York and Los Angeles.

Employment rates in 1970 were typically high for Chinese, often as high as 98% or 99%, although in Region 1 Chinese employment rates were lower than elsewhere. Otherwise there is little variation from one area to another.

As indicated by the average occupation scores for 1970, the level of Chinese occupational achievement is generally high. Chinese and Japanese women average about the same and both are very close to the occupational levels of white women. The occupational achievement of Chinese men is also relatively high, although not quite as high as for Japanese and white men. In Region 2 Chinese men and women average lower levels of occupational achievement than in other regions, but in the New York metropolitan area they recorded high average achievement. Occupational achievements of Chinese men and women in San Francisco were the lowest of the five SMSA's--12 points less than the averages in New York.

Table F. Achievements of Chinese in Major Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970

Characteristic and sex[a]	Region					SMSA				
	1	2	3	5	9	New York	Chicago	Los Angeles	San Francisco	Honolulu
LFPR: M	74	84	80	77	84	86	86	87	86	93
F	52	54	61	53	60	54	62	54	63	62
ER: M	93	98	98	97	96	98	97	96	98	99
F	95	98	99	97	96	99	100	100	97	98
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:										
M	60	67	76	65	76	76	74	75	74	86
F	39	55	57	47	56	58	61	50	60	70
Occupation score:										
M	45	38	54	52	44	50	43	50	38	49
F	34	28	41	44	29	38	30	32	26	34
Percent mobile:										
M	---	28	---	34	33	24	29*	30	36	38
F	---	30	---	---	30	26	---	26	21	27
Percent upward mobility:										
M	---	54	---	---	50	38	---	---	41	53
F	---	---	---	---	41	---	---	---	---	---
Percent with earnings of more than $3,500:										
M	54	69	75	68	72	64	70	70	69	82
F	43	50	50	52	51	54	55	41	48	67
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	67	81	85	78	79	73	78	80	77	88
F	---	65	57	73	67	66	64	58	66	84

---

[a] See page v for notations.

Among the Chinese employed in both 1965 and 1970, 30% of the men and 29% of the women were occupationally mobile on a nationwide basis. The evidence on occupational mobility for regions and SMSA's is sketchy because of the small numbers of occupationally mobile Chinese. Nevertheless, Chinese men in Honolulu appear to be most mobile, and upwardly in the occupational structure, and least mobile in New York.

At the national level, 71% of Chinese men and 55% of Chinese women were employed for 48 weeks or more in 1969. In Regions 3 and 9 Chinese workers were slightly more likely to work a full year. Only 60% and 39% of Chinese men and women worked a full year in Region 1. Their chances of full-year employment appear greater in the major metropolitan areas, except in Los Angeles where only 50% of the Chinese women had a full year of employment.

The lesser degree of success in the job market for Chinese in Region 1 is reflected further in their earnings. Only slightly more than half of Chinese men in Region 1 received earnings of $3,500 or more in 1969. Chinese women in Region 1 fared even worse, with only 43% earning $3,500 or more. Of the several regions and SMSA's, Chinese earnings were highest in Honolulu, where 88% of the Chinese men who worked a full year in 1969 had earnings of at least $3,500. The earnings of Chinese women in Honolulu were not quite as high, but nevertheless 84% of them had earnings of more than $3,500.

FILIPINOS

Participation in the labor force and employment of Filipinos generally compare favorably with other minorities. Filipino women in Chicago are particularly active in the labor force, with a LFPR of 87%, as shown in Table G. This is well above the average for Region 5 and other regions and also much higher than in other SMSA's. In contrast, only 55% of the Filipino women in Honolulu were in the labor force in 1970, a rate close to the regional average. Discrepancies in Filipino men's LFP and employment among the regions and SMSA's are smaller than for the women. In the four chief regions--Regions 2, 3, 5, 9--LFPR's for Filipino men are higher than for Chinese men, but are higher than the Japanese only in Region 3. Employment rates are highest in Region 2 and 5 and in the Chicago and Honolulu metropolitan areas.

Differences in levels of occupational achievement among regions and SMSA's are substantial. Average occupation scores for Filipino men in Chicago were 60, a full 22 points higher than their national average.

Table G. Achievements of Filipinos in Major Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970

Characteristic and sex[a]	Region				SMSA			
	2	3	5	9	Chicago	Los Angeles	San Francisco	Honolulu
LFPR: M	89	87	92	90	89	89	86	91
F	76	62	76	57	87	67	62	55
ER: M	98	94	99	96	97	95	94	98
F	99	95	97	94	98	98	96	97
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:								
M	77	83	74	75	71	76	72	90
F	45	51	54	54	66	40	57	62
Occupation score:								
M	54	61	59	32	60	39	36	31
F	46	44	47	27	46	35	31	22
Percent mobile:								
M	42*	---	50	33	---	55	48	26
F	48*	---	47*	333	---	49	39	42
Percent upward mobility:								
M	---	---	---	52	---	41*	43*	64
F	---	---	---	30	---	27*	35*	32*
Percent with earnings of more than $3,500:								
M	70	84	82	78	75	78	76	86
F	63	55	66	53	64	61	59	45
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	81	86	88	89	92	92	84	90
F	80	72	86	72	90	87	82	63

---

[a] See page vi for notations.

Filipino women in Chicago also show a high average occupational achievement of 46, compared with their national average of 34. At the other extreme, Filipino men in Honolulu had an average occupation score of only 31, and Filipino women only 22. In general, Filipinos in Region 9 and in its three SMSA's--Los Angeles, San Francisco and Honolulu--ranked far below the achievement levels of Filipinos in other areas.

The low level of occupational achievement of Filipino men in Honolulu is aggravated by their relative lack of occupational mobility. Only a fourth of Filipino men in Honolulu were mobile, whereas about half of those in Los Angeles and San Francisco were movers. Filipino men in Honolulu who were occupationally mobile, however, were relatively successful, since nearly two-thirds moved upward in the occupational structure.

Three-fourths of all Filipino men and half of all Filipino women worked 48-52 weeks in 1969, about the same as for Chinese and slightly less than for Japanese. In Honolulu, Filipino men and women bettered this national average, with 90% of the men and 62% of the women working a full year. Filipino men in Region 3 also fared comparatively well, as did Filipino women in San Francisco and Chicago. In Los Angeles, however, only 40% of the Filipino women worked a full year.

Differences in earnings are similar to those for full employment. Filipino men in Region 3 and in Honolulu show the highest proportions with $3,500 or more in 1969. The dependence of earnings on full-year employment is evident among Filipino men, where in Chicago and Los Angeles, for example, the proportions employed full-year and with earnings of $3,500 or more are about average but the proportions earning more than $3,500 who also worked a full-year in these cities are notably high. In Chicago, 71% of the Filipino men worked 48-52 weeks and 75% earned $3,500 or more, but 92% of those who worked a full-year had earnings of $3,500 or more. In contrast, 62% of Filipino women in Honolulu worked a full-year and 45% had earnings of $3,500 or more, while among those who worked a full year in Honolulu only 63% had earnings of $3,500 or more. A full year of work was far more likely to result in higher earnings for Filipino women in Chicago or Los Angeles than in Honolulu.

BLACKS

Blacks were included in this study chiefly for comparative purposes, rather than as a central part of the analysis. In general, much more is known about blacks in the total population and in the labor force than other minorities, although there have been major information gaps regarding such matters as their occupational mobility. The following information enables comparisons of the labor force participation and achievements among blacks in different parts of the country and in different metropolitan areas and also permits comparisons with other minorities. Since blacks were included primarily for comparative purposes, information on their characteristics in metropolitan areas is restricted to those metropolitan areas in which substantial numbers of other minorities live. This means that some SMSA's, such as Atlanta, with heavy concentrations of blacks are not covered in this analysis.

The heaviest concentrations of the black population occur along the Eastern seaboard, the Deep South, the Great Lakes and the far West. Six of the ten Regions--2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9--account for a large majority of the total black population. There are also six large metropolitan areas covered in this study with comparatively heavy concentrations of blacks, as listed in Table H.

Active participation of black men in the labor force is comparatively low, only 82% of the sample population in 1970, and at the national level their employment rate of 94% was at about the same level as that of Mexican and Puerto Rican men. This means that their unemployment rate was about twice as high as for white men. Among the regions where black males are most heavily concentrated, their LFPR was above the national average. In Region 5 the black male LFPR was 90%, the highest level of all regions. Their employment rates were highest in Regions 2, 3 and 4. Detroit, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C., were the three SMSA's with the highest LFPR's for black men, while in Los Angeles their LFPR was below the national average. Employment rates however, were highest for black men in New York, Philadelphia and Chicago, with Detroit providing the least employment opportunities at that time.

Black women have one of the highest LFPR's among minorities, and in 1970 their ER was at about the same level as that of Spanish origin women. Regions 3, 4, 5 and 9 show LFPR's for black women above their national average of 54%, whereas in Regions 2 and 6 their participation is just below the national average. However, among the six SMSA's included here, their participation is highest in Washington (67%), and only Detroit shows a LFPR lower than their national average. Employment rates for black women ranged from a high of 95% in Region 3 to a low of 89% in Region 9, and for the SMSA's from a high of 95% for New York to a low of 86% in Detroit.

Average levels of occupational achievement for black men and women are among the lowest. Black men attain a level about three-fourths as high as that for white men, and black women a level two-thirds as high as the level for white women. Only in Regions 5 and 9 is the occupational achievement of black men much higher than their national average, and even in these areas only two or three points higher. Their highest achievement levels are reached in Washington and Los Angeles, but in none of the Regions or SMSA's does their achievement come close to the levels reached by white men. For black women the pattern is much the same, with relatively slight departures from their national average of occupational achievement. The occupational levels of black women are exceptionally low in Regions 4 and 6, which is partly a consequence of the rural-agricultural nature of these areas. Even in the more industrialized urban areas however, black women do not benefit in their employment status as less disadvantaged women do. In Chicago black women average 27 on the occupational scale, five points higher than their national average and ten points higher than in Regions 4 and 6. In none of these area locations can their occupational achievement be regarded as high.

The incidence of changing jobs between 1965 and 1970 was not sufficiently high to suggest improvement in occupational status among blacks, although relatively high proportions of black men and women who were occupationally mobile moved upward in the occupational structure. About a third (36%) of black men were occupationally mobile and more than half of these (58%) moved upward, figures very similar to those for black women. The 56% of black women who were upwardly mobile represent an upward mobility rate higher than for white or any other minority groups of women. Much of the upward movement of black women can be attributed to their lowly occupational status, since there is "no direction but up" from the bottom. Nevertheless, other depressed minority women did not move upward at the same rate as black women.

Black men were most mobile in Regions 5 and 6, although there is not much variation among regions. Their highest mobility occurred in Chicago, where 42% changed jobs during this five-year period. In New York and Philadelphia, only 28% and 29% respectively changed jobs. The highest incidence of occupational mobility for black women occurred in Region 5 and the lowest in Regions 3 and 6. However, black women in Washington, D.C. were most mobile. More than half of the mobile black women in each of the regions were upwardly mobile, with a high of 64% in Region 2. Philadelphia affords the greatest opportunities for upward movement, since 70% of the mobile black women advanced in the occupational structure. This must be interpreted in the light of the comparatively low levels of occupational achievement for black women in Philadelphia. In Washington and Chicago fewer than half of the mobile black women moved upward. Most extreme is Washington where 63% of the movement of black women was in a downward direction.

Three-fourths of employed black men and slightly more than half of all employed black women worked a full 48-52 week year in 1969. Black workers were below these averages in Regions 4, 6 and 9, and in Detroit and Philadelphia.

The low incomes of blacks are well-known, and underscore their low average status in the labor market. Black men in the sample population, for example, averaged only $5,300 in earnings from employment in 1969, a lower average than any minority males, with the possible exception of American Indian men. There is considerable variation in earnings among the regions. In Region 4 only 56% of black men and 24% of black women had earnings of $3,500 or more in 1969. In Region 2 comparable figures were 84% for men and 64% for women. Earnings tend to be higher in urban areas for blacks, as indicated by the earnings of black men in Detroit and Chicago. Three-fourths of employed black women in Regions 4 and 6 had earnings less than $3,500, and in Regions 3, 6 and 9 only about half surpassed that level. As with men, black women fare better in metropolitan areas, although in Philadelphia more than half failed to receive as much as $3,500. Even with a control for weeks worked, black men and women in Regions 4 and 6 have earnings well below the earnings levels of other regions. In the six SMSA's, black men and women do relatively better. In Chicago, 94% of the black men had earnings of $3,500 or more if they worked a full year.

Table H. Achievements of Blacks in Major Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970

Characteristic and sex[a]	Region					
	2	3	4	5	6	9
LFPR: M	88	89	86	90	85	88
F	53	58	59	55	52	58
ER: M	95	97	96	94	94	91
F	93	95	92	92	93	89
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:						
M	79	82	71	78	73	74
F	61	62	50	54	53	49
Occupation score:						
M	33	33	29	34	31	35
F	23	22	17	22	17	23
Percent mobile:						
M	34	37	36	38	38	36
F	32	30	33	38	30	32
Percent upward mobility:						
M	62	56	54	63	58	66
F	64	57	55	59	58	56
Percent with earnings of more than $3, 500:						
M	84	76	56	82	64	80
F	64	48	24	52	24	52
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	89	84	64	88	73	90
F	78	58	28	66	30	68

Table H. (Continued)

	SMSA					
Characteristic and sex[a]	Detroit	New York	Wash., D.C.	Chicago	Philadelphia	Los Angeles
LFPR: M	88	84	86	85	87	80
F	51	55	67	58	59	60
ER: M	86	98	94	95	96	94
F	86	95	93	93	90	93
Percent worked 48-52 weeks:						
M	69	82	81	78	68	73
F	57	66	70	61	54	60
Occupation score:						
M	34	33	36	34	31	36
F	22	22	24	27	23	24
Percent mobile:						
M	34	28	34	42	29	36
F	38	30	40	36	37	37
Percent upward mobility:						
M	77	60	61	61	50*	61
F	54*	58	37	43	70	57
Percent with earnings of more than $3,500:						
M	86	83	81	87	80	75
F	56	67	63	64	48	57
Worked 48-52 weeks: M	92	90	88	94	86	84
F	69	79	72	75	62	69

[a] See page v for notations

Table 1-A. Labor Force Participation Rates, Mexicans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

Area	Male 20-34	 35-49	 50-64	Female 20-34	 35-49	 50-64
United States	.93	.93	.82	.42	.42	.30
Region						
2	.92*	.86	---	.52	.58*	---
3	.88*	---	---	.50*	---	---
4	.97	.95*	.88*	.37	.48*	---
5	.95	.96	.90	.42	.49	.33
6	.92	.93	.82	.43	.37	.25
7	.86	.96	.88*	.52	.46	.24*
8	.93	.89	.76	.35	.40	.24
9	.94	.93	.82	.41	.44	.34
10	.93	.94	.78*	.38	.41*	.29*
SMSA						
Albuquerque	.94*	.94*	---	.40*	.20*	---
Anaheim	.96	.90	.95	.39	.41	.38*
Brownsville	.86	.90	.75	.42	.37	.28
Chicago	.92	.96	.86	.43	.51	.30*
Corpus Christi	.88	.95	.87	.33	.29	.41
Dallas	.95	.90*	.82*	.47	.42	.29*
Denver	.98	.84	---	.38	.35	---
Detroit	.94	.95*	---	.41*	.61*	---
El Paso	.92	.94	.80	.47	.41	.27
Fresno	.90	.78	.75*	.34	.34	.08*
Houston	.96	.93	.93	.48	.33	.25
Laredo	.82	.88	.78	.35	.37	.18
Los Angeles	.94	.93	.82	.43	.48	.39
New York	.90*	.89*	---	.50*	.46*	---
Oxnard	.96	1.00	.85*	.40	.34	.31*
Phoenix	.92	.91	.81*	.37	.43	.26*
Sacramento	.97	.95	.71*	.39	.24	.13*
San Antonio	.90	.96	.85	.46	.41	.28
San Bernardino	.98	.99	.88	.49	.45	.19
San Diego	.94	.95	.80*	.44	.38	.41
San Francisco	.92	.94	.90	.51	.53	.42
San Jose	.96	.88	.80*	.42	.37	.31
Tucson	.96	.94	.80*	.34	.31	.56*

Table 1-B. Labor Force Participation Rates, Puerto Ricans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

Area	Male 20-34	Male 35-49	Male 50-64	Female 20-34	Female 35-49	Female 50-64
United States	.90	.88	.72	.35	.37	.30
Region						
1	.94	.87	---	.38	.40	---
2	.89	.88	.70	.31	.35	.30
3	.97	.81	---	.49	.52	.29*
4	1.00	.90*	---	.56	.56	.19*
5	.93	.90	.82*	.47	.37	.15*
9	.93	.87	.68	.50	.53	.37*
SMSA						
Chicago	.90	.95	.76*	.44	.47	.22*
Los Angeles	.73*	.95*	---	.44*	.47*	---*
Jersey City	.95	.96*	---	.40	.26*	---
Miami	---	---	---	.31*	.56*	---
Newark	.91	1.00*	---	.27	.42*	---
New York	.86	.84	.71	.30	.31	.31
San Francisco	.87*	1.00*	---	.44	---	---

Table 1-C. Labor Force Participation Rates, Cubans, by Regions, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.96	.97	.90	.60	.64	.47
Region						
2	.96	.95	.93	.53	.65	.48
3	---	1.00*	---	.62*	.62*	---
4	.94	.98	.88	.66	.64	.45
5	1.00*	1.00	---	.68*	.74	.79*
9	.96	.96	.87*	.56	.62	.29
SMSA						
Chicago	1.00*	1.00*	---	.64*	.85*	---
Jersey City	.94	.98	.91*	.73	.66	.54*
Los Angeles	.97	.98	.95*	.54	.77	.50*
Miami	.94	.96	.91	.66	.69	.46
Newark	---	.94*	.73*	.69*	.71*	---
New York	.89	.97	.90	.50	.60	.53

Table 1-D. Labor Force Participation Rates, Indians, by Region, Sex and Age, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.75	.80	.67	.42	.41	.34
Region						
1	.82*	.90*	---	.55*	.53*	---
2	.77	.89	.76	.38	.54	.44
3	.95	.85*	.87*	.53	.53	.47*
4	.80	.89	.83	.49	.43	.39
5	.86	.83	.72	.39	.45	.41
6	.72	.78	.59	.40	.42	.28
7	.74	.83	.78*	.38	.44	.38*
8	.72	.78	.57	.39	.42	.35
9	.71	.76	.63	.41	.34	.30
10	.70	.80	.67	.46	.39	.39

Table 1-E. Labor Force Participation Rates, Japanese, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

Area	Male 20-34	Male 35-49	Male 50-64	Female 20-34	Female 35-49	Female 50-64
United States	.84	.97	.92	.53	.57	.61
Region						
1	---	---	---	.52*	.58*	---
2	.88	1.00	.84*	.33	.51	.73*
3	---	.94*	---	.27	.38	.50*
4	---	---	---	.25	.38	---
5	.88	.99	.92	.32	.41	.63
6	---	---	---	.39*	.38	---
7	---	---	---	.16*	.48*	---
8	.59*	.93*	---	.58	.56	---
9	.85	.97	.92	.60	.63	.62
10	.80	.96	.93	.52	.52	.74
SMSA						
Chicago	.78	1.00	.94	.48	.66	.72*
Honolulu	.87	.98	.91	.68	.70	.60
Los Angeles	.79	.98	.94	.58	.59	.71
New York	.81	.86	---	.43	.29	---
San Francisco	.81	.99	.92	.58	.44	.73
San Jose	.81	.98	.89*	.48	.48	.69*
Seattle	.77	1.00*	.90*	.61*	.48	.47*

Table 1-F. Labor Force Participation Rates, Chinese, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.71	.96	.84	.55	.60	.54
Region						
1	.64	.92*	.80*	.54	.52*	---
2	.77	.95	.80	.53	.54	.54
3	.65	.97	.85*	.56	.66	.72*
4	.66	.95*	---	.28	---	---
5	.69	.94	.89	.51	.56	.58*
6	.49	.96	---	.30*	.54*	---
7	.68	---	---	.52*	---	---
8	.58*	---	---	---	---	---
9	.75	.96	.84	.60	.63	.54
10	.61	.96*	.80*	.56	.74*	---
SMSA						
Boston	.84	1.00*	.90*	.59	.65*	---
Chicago	.87	.92	.74*	.54	.72*	---
Honolulu	.91	.97	.91	.62	.70	.54
Los Angeles	.85	.93	.78	.46	.64	.61
New York	.77	.97	.83	.47	.56	.65
San Francisco	.75	.96	.88	.63	.66	.57
San Jose	.73*	.94*	---	.38*	---	---
Wash., D.C.	.82*	---	---	.52*	---	---

Table 1-G. Labor Force Participation Rates, Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	88	93	88	60	62	53
Region						
2	89	96*	81*	80	80*	45*
3	89	88*	---	67	46*	---
5	96	94	80*	81	64	---
9	89	93	88	55	63	50
10	85*	94*	96*	51	48*	---
SMSA						
Chicago	89	90*	---	87	88*	---
Honolulu	97	95	84	52	62	43
Los Angeles	90	98	79	65	78	52*
New York	91	---	88*	78	81*	---
San Francisco	85	93	83	67	62	34
Seattle	94*	---	83*	50*	---	---

Table 1-H. Labor Force Participation Rates of Blacks by Age, Sex and Region, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.90	.91	.80	.58	.61	.48
Region						
1	.81	.90	---	.58	.59*	.84*
2	.89	.88	.84	.47	.61	.53
3	.91	.90	.83	.62	.61	.49
4	.90	.90	.77	.61	.64	.48
5	.91	.94	.84	.59	.57	.46
6	.88	.92	.74	.51	.61	.43
7	.84	.97	.70	.69	.61	.43
9	.92	.91	.77	.65	.54	.49
SMSA						
Chicago	.94	.88	.65	.60	.60	.48
Dallas	.96*	---	---	.73*	---	.52*
Detroit	.91	.93	.80	.51	.61	.41
Los Angeles	.85	.85	.65	.68	.65	.38
Miami	---	---	---	---	.85*	---
Newark	.92	---	.88*	.62	.71	.74*
New York	.86	.88	.71	.49	.56	.64
Philadelphia	.90	.92	.79	.52	.66	.60
San Francisco	.88*	.95*	.70*	.82*	.55*	.42*
Wash., D.C.	.86	.90	.84	.73	.66	.59

Table 2-A. Labor Force Participation Rates, Mexican, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.91	.94	.95	.34	.52	.60
Region						
2	.85	---	---	.52*	.63	---
3	.89*	---	---	.44*	.48*	---
4	.92	---	---	.44	.44*	.44*
5	.94	.95	.98	.36	.61	.58
6	.89	.95	.95	.31	.57	.61
7	.92	.84	---	.31	.58	---
8	.84	.95	.97*	.25	.50	.56*
9	.90	.93	.95	.36	.48	.61
10	.88	---	---	.36	.43*	---
SMSA						
Albuquerque	.86*	---	---	.12*	.43*	---
Anaheim	.92	.96	.97*	.32	.51	.50*
Brownsville	.82	.92	.93*	.32	.58	.71
Chicago	.93	.93	.90	.44	.42	.58*
Corpus Christi	.91	.91	.83*	.31	.36	---
Dallas	.88	1.00*	---	.41	.48*	---
Denver	.92	.96*	---	.23	.59*	---
Detroit	.86	1.00*	---	.42	.55*	---
El Paso	.87	.97	1.00*	.34	.57	.76*
Fresno	.81	.88*	---	.24	.32	---
Houston	.95	.92	1.00*	.31	.60	.67*
Laredo	.81	.88	.91	.22	.53	.63*
Los Angeles	.90	.94	.96	.38	.52	.67
New York	.82*	---	---	.36*	.45*	---
Oxnard	.95	1.00*	---	.32	.46*	---
Phoenix	.90	.91	---	.33	.42	---
Sacramento	.86	1.00*	---	.21	.38*	---
San Antonio	.89	.95	1.00*	.33	.61	.64
San Bernardino	.96	.97	.97	.33	.41	.65*
San Diego	.88	.97	.96*	.36	.54	---
San Francisco	.91	.95	.90	.39	.59	.68
San Jose	.88	.98	.96*	.32	.51	---
Tucson	.88	.97	1.00*	.22	.44	---

Table 2-B. Labor Force Participation Rates, Puerto Rican, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.85	.93	.87	.29	.48	.62
Region						
1	.90	.90*	---	.32	.54*	---
2	.84	.93	.86	.27	.45	.60
3	.90	.94*	---	.38	.55*	---
4	.90	---	---	.41	.59	---
5	.92	.92	---	.34	.62	.61*
9	.81	.96	.90*	.36	.54	.88*
SMSA						
Chicago	.88	.96*	---	.37	.57	---
Jersey City	.90	---	---	.30	---	---
Los Angeles	.78	---	---	.39	.50*	---
Miami	.95*	---	---	.32	---	---
Newark	.94	---	---	.28	---	---
New York	.81	.89	.93	.23	.49	.58
Philadelphia	.86	---	---	.26	---	---
San Francisco	.91*	---	---	.40*	---	---

Table 2-C. Labor Force Participation Rates, Cuban, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.92	.96	.99	.52	.59	.72
Region						
2	.94	.93	1.00	.54	.55	.69
3	---	---	1.00*	.54*	.71*	---
4	.91	.96	.97	.51	.63	.76
5	1.00	---	1.00*	.73	.68*	.82*
6	---	---	1.00*	---	---	---
9	.87	.96	1.00	.37	.47	.78
SMSA						
Chicago	1.00*	---	1.00*	.59*	.95*	---
Jersey City	.96	.95*	.94*	.66	.65*	---
Los Angeles	1.00	.91*	.98	.56	.71	.67*
Miami	.92	.96	.96	.54	.66	.75
Newark	.81*	---	.96	.71	---	---
New York	.89	1.00	.97	.46	.64	.74

Table 2-D. Labor Force Participation Rates for Indians, by Region, Education and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.70	.82	.82	.30	.50	.61
Region						
1	.81*	---	.80*	.37*	.67*	---
2	.76	.83	.92*	.40	.46	.56*
3	.91	.88*	.90*	.44	.56	.67*
4	.82	.86	.85*	.39	.59	.53
5	.78	.88	.81	.30	.50	.69
6	.64	.82	.80	.27	.52	.59
7	.74	.91	.68*	.24	.71	.33*
8	.65	.76	.88	.31	.48	.58
9	.64	.80	.80	.25	.47	.66
10	.71	.73	.85	.38	.39	.60

Table 2-E. Labor Force Participation Rates Japanese, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.88	.96	.88	.52	.57	.59
Region						
1	---	---	---	---	.52*	.65*
2	.88*	.92*	.93	.58	.41	.45
3	---	---	.83*	.40	.28	.42
4	---	---	.88*	.46	.24	.35*
5	.87	.98	.93	.35	.38	.48
6	---	---	.75*	.40*	.34	.44*
7	---	---	---	---	.46*	---
8	---	.96*	.73	.43*	.54	.72
9	.90	.95	.89	.56	.62	.64
10	---	.98	.86	.45	.61	.54
SMSA						
Chicago	1.00*	.95	.84	.55*	.69	.53
Honolulu	.91	.95	.88	.57	.69	.73
Los Angeles	.90	.93	.88	.54	.62	.60
New York	---	.85*	.86	.45*	.27*	.49
San Francisco	.80*	.96	.92	.42	.49	.64
San Jose	---	.94	.89	.44*	.44	.60
Seattle	---	.90*	.88	---	.56	.51

Table 2-F. Labor Force Participation Rates, Chinese, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.86	.91	.77	.55	.55	.59
Region						
1	.82	.94*	.63	.50*	---	.57*
2	.87	.94	.78	.56	.49	.52
3	.88*	---	.76	.52*	.56*	.67
4	.74*	---	.78	.25*	---	.32*
5	.84	.88*	.74	.43	.44*	.60
6	---	---	.60	.44*	---	.50*
7	---	---	.74	---	---	.57*
8	---	---	.61*	---	---	---
9	.85	.91	.81	.58	.60	.62
10	.84*	---	.71	---	.63*	.65*
SMSA						
Boston	.94	---	.87	.70*	---	.52
Chicago	.83	.94	.85	.62	.47	.72*
Honolulu	.91	.96	.92	.55	.65	.63
Los Angeles	.81	.89	.89	.64	.41	.54
New York	.87	.94	.80	.51	.55	.57
San Francisco	.86	.92	.84	.60	.60	.68
San Jose	---	---	.82	---	---	.32*
Wash., D.C.	---	---	.86	---	---	.60*

Table 2-G. Labor Force Participation Rates, Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College or more
United States	88	93	90	43	54	72
Region						
2	91*	75*	93	53	59*	86
3	---	---	88	41*	47*	70
5	83	---	95	56*	---	82
9	87	93*	90	43	57	70
10	94	---	85*	37*	33*	65
SMSA						
Chicago	91	---	88	---	---	88
Honolulu	89	96	95	48	58	65
Los Angeles	76	92	93	38*	47	81
New York	94	---	92	62*	---	80
San Francisco	83	91	87	47	54	73
Seattle	92*	---	---	---	---	---

Table 2-H. Labor Force Participation Rates of Blacks by Region, SMSA, Sex and Education, 1970

Area	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.84	.91	.96	.48	.64	.75
Region						
1	.82*	.93*	---	.58	.66	---
2	.84	.91	.95	.44	.62	.70
3	.87	.89	.94	.50	.65	.75
4	.84	.90	.96	.52	.71	.77
5	.86	.93	.99	.44	.64	.75
6	.82	.93	.94	.47	.56	.72
7	.77	.87	---	.54	.59	.83*
9	.85	.87	.96	.45	.64	.75
SMSA						
Chicago	.80	.89	.92	.45	.62	.83
Dallas	.88	---	---	.58	.65*	---
Detroit	.83	.93	.96	.45	.55	.71
Los Angeles	.69	.84	.91	.47	.60	.78
Miami	---	---	---	.73	---	---
Newark	.98	.90	---	.67	.66	---
New York	.82	.86	.85	.51	.57	.64
Philadelphia	.82	.94	---	.53	.65	---
San Francisco	.82*	.80*	.94*	.46*	.70*	.79*
Wash., D.C.	.83	.89	.92*	.54	.75	.87*

Table 3-A. Employment Rates, Mexicans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

Area	Male 20-34	Male 35-49	Male 50-64	Female 20-34	Female 35-49	Female 50-64
United States	.94	.96	.96	.92	.92	.92
Region						
2	1.00*	.96*	---	.94*	---	---
3	1.00*	---	---	.93*	---	---
4	.97	.95*	1.00*	.88*	---	---
5	.97	.97	.95	.92	.96	.88*
6	.95	.97	.97	.94	.94	.95
7	.93	.95	.96*	.84	.96*	---
8	.94	.92	.98	.91	1.00	---
9	.92	.94	.94	.91	.90	.92
10	.90	.81	.94*	.90*	---	---
SMSA						
Albuquerque	.94*	.88*	---	---	---	---
Anaheim	.94	1.00	.97	.88	.86*	---
Brownsville	.91	.97	.92	.96	.90	.90
Chicago	.96	.98	1.00*	.94	.94	---
Corpus Christi	.97	.97	1.00	.90*	.96*	.94*
Dallas	.99	.96*	1.00*	.89	.94*	---
Denver	.93	.89*	---	.95*	---	---
Detroit	.87*	.89*	---	---	---	---
El Paso	.96	.98	.96	.96	.94	1.00*
Fresno	.94	.85	.89*	.77	.65*	---
Houston	.97	.98	1.00	.96	.97	---
Laredo	.89	.94	.95	.98	.98	1.00*
Los Angeles	.93	.94	.96	.95	.90	.96
New York	.94*	1.00*	---	---	---	---
Oxnard	.85	.98	1.00*	.96*	---	---
Phoenix	.96	.97	1.00*	.95	.93*	---
Sacramento	.88	.86	.87	.88*	---	---
San Antonio	.95	.98	.94	.88	.95	.91
San Bernardino	.94	.98	.97	.90	.90	---
San Diego	.94	.92	1.00*	.89	.84	1.00*
San Francisco	.90	.95	.93	.88	.92	.95*
San Jose	.93	.95	.90*	.88	.87*	---
Tucson	.94	.98	1.00*	.91*	.94*	---

Table 3-B. Employment Rates, Puerto Rican, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.93	.96	.96	.90	.93	.94
Region						
1	.91	.96*	---	.97	---	---
2	.94	.96	.94	.89	.93	.94
3	.95	.92*	---	1.00	1.00*	---
4	.95	1.00*	---	.91*	.95*	---
5	.94	.96	1.00*	.91	.83*	---
9	.89	.92	1.00*	.94	1.00*	---
SMSA						
Chicago	.94	.96	.95*	.89	.96	---
Jersey City	.95	.96*	---	.88*	---	---
Los Angeles	---	.32*	---	---	---	---
Newark	1.00	.95*	---	---	---	---
New York	.95	.97	.96	.94	.95	.94
Philadelphia	.93	.89*	---	---	---	---

Table 3-C. Employment Rates, Cubans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.95	.98	.96	.91	.94	.89
Region						
2	.96	.98	1.00	.92	.91	.88
3	---	1.00*	---	---	.87*	---
4	.97	.98	.94	.93	.96	.88
5	.82*	.94	.94*	.73*	.93*	.95*
9	.90	.96	.88*	.85	.91	---
SMSA						
Chicago	1.00*	1.00*	---	.94*	.91*	---
Jersey City	.93*	.92	1.00*	.85	.81	---
Los Angeles	.94	.86	.85*	.84*	.95	---
Miami	.96	.97	.97	.95	.91	.94
Newark	---	1.00*	---	---	.93*	---
New York	1.00	.98	1.00	.92	.92	.96

Table 3-D. Employment Rates, Indian, by Region, Sex and Age, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.89	.90	.92	.88	.92	.92
Region						
1	---	.94*	---	1.00*	---	---
2	.82	.92	1.00*	1.00*	.88*	.94*
3	.95	.96*	---	.89*	.95*	---
4	.97	1.00	.98	.91	.95	.89*
5	.95	.87	.91	.88	.94	.86*
6	.92	.92	.94	.88	.96	.97
7	.89	1.00*	.95*	.84*	.88*	---
8	.78	.80	.83	.83	.88	.96*
9	.86	.93	.88	.88	.94	.90
10	.82	.80	.80*	.85	.78	.92*

Table 3-E. Employment Rates, Japanese, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.98	.99	.99	.97	.97	.98
Region						
2	1.00	.98	.88*	.90*	1.00	.95*
3	---	1.00*	---	---	.96*	---
4	---	---	---	---	1.00*	---
5	.98	.99	1.00	1.00*	.95	1.00*
6	---	---	---	---	1.00*	---
8	.88*	.96*	---	.95*	1.00	---
9	.98	.99	.99	.98	.98	.97
10	.97	1.00	.97	.94	.93	1.00*
SMSA						
Chicago	1.00	.98	1.00	1.00*	1.00	1.00*
Honolulu	.97	1.00	1.00	.98	.98	1.00
Los Angeles	.97	.98	.98	.96	.96	.98
New York	.94	.97	---	.87*	---	---
San Francisco	.94	.99	1.00	.96	1.00	.96*
San Jose	.97	1.00	1.00*	1.00*	1.00*	---
Seattle	.88*	1.00*	.95*	.88*	.91*	---

Table 3-F. Employment Rates, Chinese, By Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.96	.98	.95	.96	.97	.95
Region						
1	.89	1.00*	.94*	.95*	---	---
2	.97	.98	.97	.98	.96	1.00
3	.97	1.00*	1.00*	.97	1.00*	---
4	.90*	1.00*	---	---	---	---
5	.96	.98	1.00	.97	1.00*	---
6	.90*	.96*	---	---	---	---
7	1.00*	---	---	---	---	---
9	.96	.97	.93	.95	.98	.94
10	1.00*	1.00*	.94*	---	---	---
SMSA						
Boston	1.00	1.00*	.94*	.95*	---	---
Chicago	.94	1.00	1.00*	1.00*	1.00*	---
Honolulu	.99	.98	1.00	.94	1.00	1.00
Los Angeles	.97	.96	.94	1.00	1.00	1.00*
New York	1.00	.99	.95	1.00	.97	.98
San Francisco	.97	.98	.97	.95	.99	.96
Wash., D.C.	.94*	---	---	---	---	---

Table 3-G. Employment Rates of Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	95	97	96	96	95	95
Region						
2	100*	100*	88*	99	100*	---
3	97	---	---	98	---	---
5	98	100*	100*	98	100*	---
9	94	97	96	94	95	96
10	91*	94*	96*	95*	---	---
SMSA						
Chicago	98	94*	---	98	---	---
Honolulu	97	99	98	98	95	96*
Los Angeles	98	95	88	97	100	---
New York	100*	---	---	97	---	---
San Francisco	92	96	95	97	94	---
Seattle	---	---	100*	---	---	---

Table 3-H. Employment Rates for Blacks, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.93	.96	.96	.89	.95	.96
Region						
1	.92*	.94*	---	.93*	1.00*	---
2	.91	.97	.99	.91	.93	.95
3	.96	.97	.97	.93	.97	.95
4	.96	.96	.96	.88	.94	.96
5	.92	.94	.96	.88	.94	.97
6	.92	.96	.94	.88	.94	1.00
7	.88	.97	1.00*	.90*	.95	.94*
9	.88	.94	.89	.84	.93	.97
SMSA						
Chicago	.94	.99	.91	.94	.92	.92
Dallas	.96*	---	---	1.00*	---	---
Detroit	.73	1.00	.93	.79	.92	.86
Los Angeles	.93	.95	.96*	.96	.85*	---
Miami	---	---	---	---	.91*	---
Newark	.95	.96*	---	.86*	.93*	.88*
New York	.98	.98	.96	.93	.98	.95
Philadelphia	.90	.98	1.00	.91	.92	.86
San Francisco	.86*	.75*	---	.96*	---	---
Wash., D.C.	.93	.93	.97	.93	.89	.97

Table 4-A. Employment Rates, Mexican, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.94	.95	.96	.91	.93	.95
Region						
2	.96*	---	---	---	1.00*	---
3	1.00*	---	---	---	---	---
4	.96	---	---	.90*	---	---
5	.96	.98	1.00	.92	.96	.95*
6	.96	.97	.97	.94	.95	.95
7	.96	.92*	---	.92*	.87*	---
8	.92	.95	1.00*	.90	.95	---
9	.92	.94	.95	.89	.92	.96
10	.89	---	---	.85	---	---
SMSA						
Albuquerque	.90*	---	---	---	---	---
Anaheim	.96	.98	.97*	.85	.93*	---
Brownsville	.93	.94	1.00*	.91	.97	1.00*
Chicago	.96	.98	1.00*	.93	1.00*	---
Corpus Christi	.98	.97	---	.93	---	---
Dallas	.99	.96*	---	.90	---	---
Denver	.89	.96*	---	---	1.00*	---
Detroit	.84	.94*	---	---	---	---
El Paso	.97	.98	.93*	.95	.98	.94*
Fresno	.87	1.00*	---	.66	---	---
Houston	.98	.97	1.00*	.96	.98	---
Laredo	.92	.94	.97*	.98	.97	1.00*
Los Angeles	.93	.94	.95	.92	.94	.96
New York	1.00*	---	---	---	---	---
Oxnard	.93	.90*	---	.89*	---	---
Phoenix	.96	1.00*	---	.93	---	---
Sacramento	.86	.89*	---	---	---	---
San Antonio	.96	.98	.89	.90	.92	.96*
San Bernardino	.96	.97	.97	.91	.90*	.94*
San Deigo	.92	.95	.96*	.90	.88	---
San Francisco	.93	.89	.97	.86	.96	.88*
San Jose	.93	.94	.96*	.83	.83*	---
Tucson	.96	.94	1.00*	.90*	.95*	---

Table 4-B. Employment Rates, Puerto Rican, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.94	.96	.97	.91	.93	.94
Region						
1	.92	.95*	---	1.00*	---	---
2	.94	.96	.97	.90	.93	.94
3	.94	---	---	1.00*	1.00*	---
4	.96	---	---	.96*	.90*	---
5	.94	.98	---	.87	.91	---
9	.88	.95	.94*	.93*	.96	---
SMSA						
Chicago	.94	.96*	---	.92	.90*	---
Jersey City	.94	---	---	.87*	---	---
Los Angeles	.90*	---	---	---	---	---
Miami	.90*	---	---	---	---	---
Newark	.98	---	---	.82*	---	---
New York	.95	.98	.98	.94	.96	.92
Philadelphia	.91	---	---	.83*	---	---
San Francisco	.80*	---	---	---	---	---

Table 4-C. Employment Rates, Cuban, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	 H.S. 12	 College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	 H.S. 12	 College 1 or more
United States	.96	.96	.97	.91	.91	.93
Region						
2	.98	.98	.99	.91	.86	.94
3	---	---	1.00*	---	---	---
4	.96	.97	.96	.91	.96	.93
5	.88	---	.96*	.88	---	.94*
6	---	---	1.00*	---	---	---
9	.91	.92*	.94	.88	.92*	.87
SMSA						
Chicago	1.00*	---	1.00*	.94*	.89*	---
Jersey City	.95	.95*	.88*	.77	.94*	---
Los Angeles	.88	.90*	.88	.93*	.92*	.81*
Miami	.96	.98	.98	.93	.92	.94
Newark	1.00*	---	---	.96*	---	---
New York	.99	.98	1.00	.92	.92	.97

Table 4-D. Employment Rates, Indian, by Region, Sex and Education, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.89	.89	.95	.88	.92	.92
Region						
1	.88*	---	---	---	---	---
2	.86	.97*	.91*	.87*	1.00*	---
3	.90	1.00*	1.00*	.91*	.87*	---
4	.99	1.00	.91*	.90	.92	1.00*
5	.91	.89	1.00	.88	.89	.94
6	.91	.92	.98	.89	.94	.95
7	.98	.87*	1.00*	.87*	.88*	---
8	.80	.75	.86	.87	.90	.80*
9	.86	.90	.95	.86	.92	.92
10	.80	.76	.93*	.84	.85	.84

Table 4-E. Employment Rates, Japanese, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.98	.99	.98	.95	.98	.98
Region						
2	---	.96*	1.00	.90*	.97	.98
3	---	---	1.00*	1.00*	---	---
5	.96*	1.00	.99	.95*	.96	1.00
8	---	.96*	.93*	---	1.00*	.96
9	.98	.99	.98	.96	.98	.98
10	---	.98	.98	.76*	.97	1.00
SMSA						
Chicago	1.00*	.97	1.00	---	1.00	1.00*
Honolulu	1.00	.98	.99	.98	.98	1.00
Los Angeles	.97	.96	.99	.91	.97	.97
New York	---	.96*	.98	---	---	1.00*
San Francisco	1.00*	.98	.97	.94*	.96	1.00
San Jose	---	.97*	1.00	---	1.00*	1.00*
Seattle	---	.94*	.97	---	.96*	.84*

Table 4-F. Employment Rates, Chinese, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.95	.96	.98	.95	.96	.97
Region						
1	.89*	.87*	1.00	---	---	.94*
2	.97	.98	.98	.97	1.00	.98
3	.96*	---	1.00	---	---	.95
4	---	---	.93*	---	---	---
5	.95	.95*	.98	.96*	---	.98
6	---	---	.90*	---	---	---
7	---	---	1.00	---	---	---
9	.94	.96	.97	.94	.96	.97
10	.95*	---	1.00	---	---	---
SMSA						
Boston	1.00	---	1.00	1.00*	---	---
Chicago	1.00	.88*	.98	1.00*	---	1.00*
Honolulu	.98	.98	1.00	1.00	.96	1.00
Los Angeles	.91	1.00	.96	1.00	1.00*	1.00
New York	.98	.99	.98	.97	1.00	1.00
San Francisco	.96	.96	.99	.94	.99	.98

Table 4-G. Employment Rates of Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College or more
United States	96	95	96	92	94	97
Region						
2	95*	---	100	100*	---	99
3	---	---	95	---	---	98
5	---	---	99	---	---	98
9	96	96	95	91	95	96
10	97	---	91*	---	---	100*
SMSA						
Chicago	---	---	98	---	---	98
Honolulu	98	99	97	94	98	98
Los Angeles	96*	94	95	---	---	99
New York	---	---	100	---	---	97
San Francisco	97	94	93	93	88	99
Seattle	100*	---	---	---	---	---

Table 4-H. Employment Rates for Blacks, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.94	.95	.96	.92	.92	.97
Region						
1	.89*	.92*	---	.96*	.97*	---
2	.94	.98	.95	.89	.94	1.00
3	.96	.97	1.00	.92	.97	1.00
4	.96	.95	.98	.91	.91	.98
5	.93	.95	.94	.93	.90	.98
6	.93	.96	1.00*	.94	.93	.90
7	.96	.91	---	.96	.91	---
9	.90	.90	.92	.88	.85	.96
SMSA						
Chicago	.96	.95	.94	.92	.91	.96
Dallas	1.00*	---	---	.83*	---	---
Detroit	.84	.84	.96*	.87	.86	---
Los Angeles	.98	.92	.93	.94	.94	.92
Miami	.97*	---	---	.93*	---	---
Newark	.95	.92*	---	.89	.90*	---
New York	.97	.98	.97	.96	.94	.94
Philadelphia	.97	.96	---	.86	.93	---
San Francisco	.70*	---	.94*	---	---	---
Wash., D.C.	.91	.96	1.00*	.92	.92	.96*

Table 5-A. Occupation of Mexicans, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	N	All	Prof.	Mgr.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Lab.	Farm	Ser.
Male											
United States	8501	100.0	4.6	4.1	2.7	5.2	22.3	28.0	13.5	10.5	9.1
Region											
2	52	100.0	23.1	3.8	9.6	7.7	19.2	26.9	7.7	0.0	1.9
4	73	100.0	9.6	1.4	2.7	5.5	20.5	15.0	8.2	28.7	8.2
5	662	100.0	4.5	2.1	1.5	5,3	19.3	41.5	15.6	2.1	8.0
6	3114	100.0	4.4	5.3	3.2	5.6	23.8	24.7	13.5	10.5	9.0
7	115	100.0	3.5	7.0	3.5	6.1	23.5	22.6	21.7	3.5	8.7
8	252	100.0	5.6	2.4	2.4	5.2	20.2	24.6	15.9	11.1	12.7
9	4070	100.0	4.1	3.6	2.5	4.9	21.9	29.3	13.2	11.2	9.3
10	108	100.0	5.6	3.7	0.9	2.8	12.0	16.7	11.1	39.9	7.4
SMSA											
Anaheim	196	100.0	5.1	4.1	3.1	5.1	24.5	25.0	19.9	3.1	10.2
Brownsville	349	100.0	3.2	6.3	7.4	2.6	15.2	19.4	12.6	21.2	12.0
Chicago	365	100.0	4.1	2.2	3.0	6.8	20.3	40.9	14.0	.3	8.5
Corpus Christi	185	100.0	5.4	5.4	5.9	3.2	21.6	21.7	19.5	6.0	11.4
Dallas	124	100.0	2.4	4.0	2.4	8.9	25.0	26.7	15.3	4.8	10.5
Denver	82	100.0	6.1	6.1	2.4	8.5	19.5	34.1	15.9	1.2	6.1
Detroit	59	100.0	6.8	3.4	5.1	13.6	15.3	37.9	11.9	---	6.8
El Paso	284	100.0	6.3	4.6	4.9	7.4	29.2	22.2	13.7	2.5	9.2
Fresno	149	100.0	6.0	1.3	---	2.7	10.1	22.2	4.7	46.3	6.7
Houston	299	100.0	3.0	5.0	3.3	6.7	25.1	31.7	12.7	1.3	11.0
Laredo	291	100.0	4.1	6.2	5.5	4.5	17.9	13.7	13.7	25.1	9.0
Los Angeles	1717	100.0	5.2	3.1	2.4	5.6	24.9	36.2	11.5	1.2	9.9
Oxnard	112	100.0	5.4	3.6	2.7	0.9	15.2	26.2	13.4	25.9	7.1
Phoenix	171	100.0	3.5	4.1	4.7	7.6	17.0	21.7	17.5	15.8	8.2
Sacramento	90	100.0	5.6	4.4	---	6.7	15.6	21.1	25.6	10.0	11.1
San Antonio	483	100.0	4.3	4.1	5.6	6.6	32.3	23.8	11.2	1.4	10.6
San Bernardino	271	100.0	5.2	2.2	4.1	4.1	22.1	22.5	13.7	14.7	11.4
San Diego	170	100.0	6.5	2.4	4.1	4.1	24.7	21.2	11.8	11.8	13.5
San Francisco	252	100.0	3.2	2.0	2.0	8.7	22.2	28.2	16.3	4.0	13.5
San Jose	203	100.0	6.4	4.4	1.0	7.4	27.1	26.1	14.3	3.0	10.3
Tucson	109	100.0	3.7	2.8	4.6	5.5	26.6	30.3	13.8	5.5	7.3

Table 5-A. Continued

Female											
United States	6286	100.0	4.7	1.5	5.5	21.8	2.4	29.8	1.7	7.6	24.6
Region											
2	51	100.0	9.8	3.9	3.9	37.3	3.9	23.5	0.0	0.0	17.7
4	53	100.0	11.3	3.8	3.8	17.0	3.8	24.5	0.0	15.1	20.8
5	411	100.0	5.8	1.0	6.1	23.8	2.7	41.6	1.7	1.7	15.5
6	2222	100.0	5.0	1.8	6.6	20.8	2.5	23.0	1.6	6.3	32.2
7	98	100.0	5.1	2.0	5.1	27.6	4.1	22.4	4.1	3.1	26.5
8	158	100.0	6.3	0.6	7.0	20.9	1.9	20.3	3.2	2.5	37.3
9	3170	100.0	3.9	1.3	4.7	21.9	2.4	34.6	1.6	8.9	20.4
10	71	100.0	4.2	1.4	5.6	9.9	0.0	23.9	1.4	38.0	15.5
SMSA											
Anaheim	138	100.0	5.1	1.4	5.1	20.3	.7	40.6	2.2	2.9	21.7
Brownsville	295	100.0	6.8	1.7	7.1	15.9	2.0	22.7	1.0	17.3	25.4
Chicago	204	100.0	3.4	---	3.4	22.1	3.9	52.9	2.5	.5	11.3
Corpus Christi	102	100.0	4.9	2.0	10.8	17.6	3.9	14.7	---	2.0	44.1
Dallas	94	100.0	2.1	---	1.1	24.5	4.3	43.6	2.1	3.2	19.2
Denver	70	100.0	4.3	1.4	4.3	25.7	---	31.4	1.4	2.9	28.6
El Paso	258	100.0	5.8	1.9	7.4	18.6	5.0	30.6	1.6	---	29.1
Fresno	121	100.0	1.7	---	2.5	14.9	---	29.8	1.7	31.4	18.2
Houston	205	100.0	4.9	2.0	8.3	28.8	3.4	18.5	1.5	2.0	30.7
Laredo	186	100.0	11.8	4.3	11.3	21.0	1.1	9.1	1.6	10.2	29.6
Los Angeles	1379	100.0	4.1	1.6	3.8	25.1	3.1	45.5	1.6	.9	13.8
Oxnard	81	100.0	2.5	2.5	1.2	16.0	2.5	43.2	1.2	14.8	16.0
Phoenix	120	100.0	4.2	---	5.8	24.2	---	35.0	1.7	9.2	20.0
Sacramento	64	100.0	3.1	---	7.8	25.0	1.6	28.1	---	17.2	17.2
San Antonio	377	100.0	5.6	1.9	7.2	26.0	4.2	25.7	.8	1.6	27.1
San Bernandino	202	100.0	6.4	1.0	2.5	15.3	2.0	33.2	3.0	10.4	26.3
San Diego	154	100.0	5.2	1.9	7.1	19.5	2.6	23.4	1.9	5.2	33.1
San Francisco	192	100.0	6.8	2.1	4.7	30.7	1.0	28.6	3.1	3.1	19.8
San Jose	162	100.0	4.3	2.5	3.1	14.2	3.1	53.7	1.2	4.9	13.0
Tucson	73	100.0	4.1	1.4	16.4	26.0	2.7	23.3	---	---	26.0

Table 5-B. Occupation of Puerto Ricans, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	N	All	Prof.	Mgr.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Lab.	Farm	Ser.
Male											
United States	2702	100.0	3.9	4.6	3.9	9.5	16.2	34.9	8.1	1.5	17.5
Region											
1	119	100.0	1.7	5.0	3.4	7.6	18.5	39.5	13.4	1.6	9.2
2	1968	100.0	3.5	5.0	4.5	10.2	16.1	32.8	7.0	1.0	19.8
3	101	100.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	15.8	35.6	11.9	5.0	17.8
4	76	100.0	6.6	6.6	3.9	2.6	27.6	19.8	5.3	9.2	18.4
5	284	100.0	2.1	0.7	1.8	8.1	13.7	54.9	10.9	0.7	7.0
9	132	100.0	11.4	5.3	0.8	9.8	14.4	28.8	12.1	3.8	13.6
SMSA											
Chicago	191	100.0	1.6	2.6	2.1	9.9	15.2	51.8	4.7	---	12.0
Jersey City	75	100.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	4.0	9.3	46.7	22.7	---	13.3
Newark	60	100.0	10.0	1.7	3.3	5.0	18.3	48.3	5.0	---	8.3
New York	1626	100.0	3.4	4.2	5.4	13.0	16.7	31.0	6.6	.2	19.6
Philadelphia	84	100.0	8.3	4.8	1.2	3.6	10.7	38.1	15.5	4.8	13.1
Female											
United States	1882	100.0	5.8	1.4	3.9	25.1	3.0	45.4	1.1	0.6	13.7
Region											
1	71	100.0	8.5	1.4	5.6	12.7	0.0	53.5	2.8	1.4	14.1
2	1344	100.0	4.8	1.0	3.6	26.2	3.4	46.7	1.2	.3	12.7
3	79	100.0	10.1	5.1	2.5	20.3	3.8	44.3	1.3	2.5	10.1
4	65	100.0	7.7	4.6	6.2	29.2	4.6	23.1	0.0	1.5	23.1
5	172	100.0	8.1	1.2	5.2	16.3	2.3	55.2	1.2	0.0	10.5
6	20	100.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	30.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
9	111	100.0	5.4	1.8	1.8	33.3	0.0	31.5	0.0	1.8	24.3
SMSA											
Chicago	113	100.0	2.7	1.8	3.5	8.8	3.5	69.9	2.7	---	7.1
New York	1087	100.0	4.1	1.2	3.1	28.7	2.7	46.7	1.7	.1	11.8

Table 5-C. Occupation of Cubans, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	N	All	Prof.	Mgr.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Lab.	Farm	Ser.
Male											
United States	1323	100.0	11.3	9.1	5.2	10.4	18.2	26.7	4.5	0.6	14.0
Region											
1	28	100.0	25.0	21.4	3.6	3.6	0.0	25.0	3.6	0.0	17.9
2	397	100.0	9.6	7.8	4.3	10.1	13.9	32.2	3.5	0.0	18.7
3	39	100.0	20.5	2.6	2.6	2.6	28.2	28.2	7.7	0.0	7.7
4	613	100.0	9.1	10.1	6.5	11.4	21.9	23.8	5.7	0.5	11.0
5	71	100.0	16.9	9.9	1.4	15.5	18.3	28.2	0.0	0.0	9.9
6	25	100.0	24.0	20.0	8.0	8.0	28.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
9	129	100.0	12.4	6.2	5.4	9.3	14.0	28.7	3.1	3.2	17.8
SMSA											
Chicago	54	100.0	9.3	5.6	5.6	16.7	20.4	37.0	5.6	---	---
Jersey City	101	100.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	12.9	21.8	41.6	4.0	---	8.9
Los Angeles	107	100.0	10.3	5.6	1.9	13.1	20.6	30.8	6.5	---	11.2
Miami	539	100.0	10.8	7.8	5.0	8.2	24.7	24.1	5.8	.9	12.6
Newark	39	100.0	2.6	7.7	---	10.3	15.4	41.1	12.8	---	10.3
New York	240	100.0	9.6	8.3	3.8	15.8	17.1	15.8	3.8	---	25.8
Female											
United States	1193	100.0	8.3	1.2	5.1	22.5	2.3	46.5	1.0	0.6	12.5
Region											
1	23	100.0	8.7	0.0	4.3	34.8	0.0	30.4	0.0	4.4	17.4
2	342	100.0	9.4	1.2	3.2	23.7	2.0	49.1	0.9	0.0	10.6
3	40	100.0	12.5	0.0	5.0	27.5	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
4	571	100.0	5.6	1.4	6.8	20.0	2.8	48.7	0.7	0.7	13.3
5	74	100.0	13.5	0.0	4.1	18.9	2.7	45.9	2.7	0.0	12.2
9	105	100.0	10.5	1.0	3.8	24.8	1.9	47.6	1.9	0.0	8.6
SMSA											
Chicago	55	100.0	---	---	3.6	38.2	3.6	45.5	---	1.8	7.3
Jersey City	97	100.0	9.3	1.0	6.2	18.6	3.1	61.9	---	---	---
Los Angeles	88	100.0	2.3	---	4.5	20.5	2.3	60.2	---	---	10.2
Miami	515	100.0	6.2	1.6	4.5	19.8	2.3	52.3	.4	.8	12.3
Newark	39	100.0	2.6	---	2.6	7.7	2.6	76.9	---	---	7.7
New York	205	100.0	10.2	1.5	1.5	29.3	2.4	37.6	1.0	---	16.6

Table 5-D. Occupation of Indians, by Region, and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	N	All	Prof.	Mgr.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Lab.	Farm	Ser.
Male											
United States	2690	100.0	8.7	3.8	2.2	5.1	21.7	23.0	17.2	8.8	9.3
Region											
1	45	100.0	17.8	6.7	2.2	4.4	13.3	31.1	11.1	2.2	11.1
2	126	100.0	10.3	6.3	3.2	15.1	24.6	13.9	8.7	4.8	11.1
3	79	100.0	12.7	1.3	2.5	8.9	29.1	24.1	10.1	3.8	7.6
4	246	100.0	5.3	4.9	1.6	3.3	23.2	26.8	11.4	19.5	4.1
5	302	100.0	7.6	2.0	2.3	7.0	19.9	23.2	16.9	3.0	9.6
6	638	100.0	9.4	3.0	2.2	5.3	24.8	21.3	17.1	6.9	9.7
7	98	100.0	8.2	2.0	---	6.1	24.5	23.5	21.4	7.1	7.1
8	279	100.0	9.3	4.7	0.4	3.2	22.2	19.0	15.1	18.0	8.3
9	621	100.0	8.9	3.5	3.5	3.5	20.1	23.5	19.5	7.1	10.3
10	256	100.0	6.6	6.6	1.2	3.9	15.2	18.0	25.8	10.6	12.1
Female											
United States	2247	100.0	9.4	2.0	4.5	22.2	1.5	21.6	2.6	3.7	32.6
Region											
2	91	100.0	17.6	2.2	4.4	20.9	3.3	19.8	1.1	2.2	28.6
3	77	100.0	16.9	---	3.9	29.9	---	22.1	---	2.6	24.7
4	220	100.0	7.7	4.1	4.5	11.8	2.3	37.3	0.9	10.9	20.4
5	255	100.0	8.6	2.4	6.3	25.1	2.0	25.5	2.7	2.0	25.5
6	526	100.0	10.1	1.1	5.1	19.8	1.5	21.7	3.8	1.2	35.8
7	76	100.0	5.3	---	---	30.3	5.3	13.2	7.9	1.3	36.8
8	233	100.0	13.3	2.6	2.6	19.3	0.4	12.8	2.1	4.3	42.5
9	515	100.0	6.4	1.9	5.0	26.8	0.8	17.7	1.6	3.3	36.5
10	217	100.0	6.9	2.3	4.1	23.5	1.8	10.5	3.7	7.0	29.0

Table 5-E. Occupation of Japanese, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	N	All	Prof.	Mgr.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Lab.	Farm	Ser.
Male											
United States	2820	100.0	22.7	10.9	5.1	9.0	21.4	9.8	9.7	4.9	6.6
Region											
2	123	100.0	35.0	18.7	9.8	13.8	12.2	3.3	3.3	.8	3.3
5	178	100.0	36.0	10.7	3.9	10.7	18.5	10.7	4.5	.6	4.5
8	66	100.0	18.2	3.0	6.1	9.1	19.7	12.2	9.1	16.6	6.1
9	2164	100.0	19.5	10.9	5.0	9.1	24.1	9.7	10.9	4.2	6.5
10	136	100.0	24.3	12.5	4.4	6.6	8.8	13.3	7.4	13.9	8.8
SMSA											
Chicago	131	100.0	20.6	9.2	6.1	9.9	21.4	13.7	3.1	2.3	13.7
Los Angeles	542	100.0	25.5	12.5	8.1	7.2	13.7	8.3	16.4	2.6	5.7
Honolulu	1121	100.0	15.0	11.6	5.8	11.1	31.7	10.7	5.2	2.3	6.7
New York	97	100.0	20.6	30.9	13.4	12.4	5.2	6.2	3.1	---	8.2
San Francisco	173	100.0	29.5	11.6	4.0	9.2	12.7	9.2	12.7	4.1	6.9
San Jose	97	100.0	33.0	9.3	6.2	12.4	12.4	14.5	7.2	5.2	---
Seattle	68	100.0	27.9	16.2	5.9	8.8	17.6	10.3	5.9	---	7.4
Female											
United States	3039	100.0	16.6	3.5	5.9	34.5	1.4	14.7	.8	1.9	20.8
Region											
2	129	100.0	21.7	1.6	6.2	41.1	.8	16.3	---	.8	11.6
3	70	100.0	17.1	5.7	5.7	27.1	---	17.1	---	---	27.1
4	66	100.0	9.1	1.5	3.0	25.8	3.0	28.8	3.0	3.0	22.8
5	185	100.0	23.8	3.2	3.2	29.7	1.6	18.4	1.1	1.1	17.9
8	78	100.0	15.4	1.3	7.7	29.5	---	14.1	1.3	2.6	28.2
9	2226	100.0	16.3	3.5	6.2	36.3	1.3	13.0	.7	2.0	20.7
10	158	100.0	15.8	5.1	5.7	25.3	3.2	16.5	1.9	3.1	22.8
SMSA											
Chicago	121	100.0	31.4	6.6	3.3	33.9	1.7	16.5	.8	.8	5.0
Honolulu	1079	100.0	15.0	4.0	9.4	34.1	1.4	11.1	.5	1.5	23.0
Los Angeles	467	100.0	16.7	2.8	4.3	40.9	.9	16.7	1.7	.4	15.6
New York	59	100.0	33.9	3.4	5.1	39.0	1.7	3.4	---	---	13.6
San Francisco	187	100.0	16.0	2.7	7.0	41.2	1.1	8.6	1.1	2.1	20.3
San Jose	81	100.0	17.3	---	4.9	34.6	1.2	18.5	---	4.9	18.5
Seattle	71	100.0	19.7	8.5	8.5	32.4	2.8	9.9	1.4	4.2	12.7

Table 5-F. Occupation of Chinese, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	N	All	Prof.	Mgr.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Lab.	Farm	Ser.
Male											
United States	2422	100.0	31.7	10.8	4.0	8.4	8.4	10.6	2.6	.7	23.0
Region											
1	95	100.0	42.1	8.4	2.1	2.1	4.2	9.5	3.2	---	28.4
2	502	100.0	28.5	8.2	4.4	7.4	5.0	14.1	1.2	.2	31.1
3	97	100.0	47.4	14.4	1.0	4.1	7.2	3.1	2.1	---	20.6
4	57	100.0	47.4	17.5	---	3.5	5.3	8.8	1.8	1.8	14.0
5	216	100.0	48.6	7.4	2.3	3.2	4.2	8.8	2.8	---	22.7
6	62	100.0	40.3	9.7	6.5	6.5	4.8	12.9	---	---	19.4
9	1244	100.0	25.9	12.4	4.8	11.2	11.6	10.6	3.4	1.1	19.1
10	72	100.0	26.4	11.1	1.4	9.7	5.6	8.3	2.8	---	34.7
SMSA											
Boston	80	100.0	28.8	15.0	---	7.5	1.3	11.3	2.5	---	33.8
Chicago	105	100.0	34.3	5.7	4.8	5.7	8.6	3.8	1.0	---	36.2
Honolulu	268	100.0	22.8	14.2	4.9	11.6	20.9	7.5	3.4	.4	14.6
Los Angeles	239	100.0	38.1	10.9	5.4	8.8	5.4	10.5	3.3	---	17.6
New York	424	100.0	18.9	8.7	4.2	7.5	3.8	18.9	1.2	.2	36.6
San Francisco	486	100.0	17.7	11.7	7.6	12.1	9.7	10.9	2.7	.4	27.1
Female											
United States	1765	100.0	22.7	3.5	4.5	31.2	1.6	21.4	.7	.6	13.8
Region											
1	53	100.0	28.3	1.9	1.9	30.2	---	34.0	---	---	3.8
2	309	100.0	19.4	5.5	2.6	25.9	1.3	36.6	.6	---	8.0
3	92	100.0	33.7	3.3	2.2	31.5	2.2	13.0	---	---	14.1
5	150	100.0	44.7	1.3	4.7	19.3	.7	17.3	1.3	---	10.7
9	1008	100.0	17.8	3.0	5.2	35.4	2.0	19.1	.8	1.1	15.7
SMSA											
Boston	55	100.0	19.6	1.8	1.8	28.6	---	33.9	---	---	14.3
Chicago	59	100.0	27.1	---	---	25.4	1.7	33.9	---	---	11.9
Honolulu	229	100.0	22.3	4.8	4.4	41.0	1.3	7.9	1.7	.9	15.7
Los Angeles	160	100.0	25.0	3.8	6.3	26.9	---	28.1	.6	---	9.4
New York	268	100.0	13.8	2.6	2.2	28.7	.7	44.8	.4	---	6.7
San Francisco	402	100.0	13.7	2.7	5.2	38.8	1.0	24.9	.5	.2	12.9

Table 5-G. Occupation of Filipinos, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	N	All	Prof.	Mgr.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Lab.	Farm	Ser.
Male											
United States	1480	100.0	18.6	2.9	2.1	9.2	14.1	16.2	6.9	10.5	19.1
Region											
2	88	100.0	44.3	9.1	---	10.2	9.1	9.1	2.3	1.1	14.8
3	60	100.0	58.3	1.7	3.3	13.3	5.0	5.0	1.7	---	11.7
5	102	100.0	51.0	1.0	4.9	14.7	5.9	12.7	2.0	---	7.8
9	1088	100.0	9.7	2.7	2.1	8.4	16.3	17.9	8.2	13.6	21.3
10	66	100.0	18.2	4/5	---	6.1	13.6	19.7	9.1	7.5	21.2
SMSA											
Honolulu	464	100.0	4.1	2.8	1.5	4.1	26.5	22.2	12.1	14.9	11.9
Los Angeles	146	100.0	23.3	2.1	2.1	22.6	12.3	11.6	6.2	---	19.9
San Francisco	204	100.0	14.7	4.4	1.5	20.1	12.7	9.8	4.9	2.5	29.4
Female											
United States	1306	100.0	29.5	1.1	5.1	26.7	.8	12.8	.9	2.9	20.4
Region											
2	126	100.0	55.6	.8	.8	27.8	---	4.0	.8	---	10.4
3	108	100.0	54.6	---	.9	22.2	1.9	8.3	.9	---	11.2
5	140	100.0	57.1	1.4	1.4	20.7	.7	2.9	---	.7	15.0
9	755	100.0	16.2	1.2	6.9	29.7	.8	16.5	2.6	23.8	
10	62	100.0	11.3	4.8	1.6	25.8	---	25.8	1.6	1.8	22.6
SMSA											
Chicago	119	100.0	68.1	2.5	1.7	21.0	---	3.4	1.7	---	1.7
Honolulu	283	100.0	8.1	1.1	6.7	22.6	.7	23.7	1.1	6.4	30.0
Los Angeles	140	100.0	29.3	2.9	7.1	30.7	.7	---	---	---	14.3
San Francisco	198	100.0	18.2	3.0	1.5	46.0	2.0	---	---	---	23.2

Table 5-H. Occupation of Blacks by Region SMSA and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	No.	Pct.	Prof.	Mgr.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Lab.	Farm	Ser.
Male											
United States	3880	100.0	5.4	2.5	2.0	7.6	16.0	30.5	17.0	4.9	14.3
Region											
1	64	100.0	12.5	---	---	14.1	25.0	28.2	12.5	---	7.8
2	510	100.0	7.3	2.7	3.3	12.4	15.3	32.5	11.4	.6	14.5
3	583	100.0	6.7	2.6	1.2	10.5	16.3	26.5	17.5	3.1	15.6
4	1132	100.0	4.4	1.7	1.2	3.6	14.0	28.7	20.6	11.6	14.1
5	734	100.0	5.3	2.7	2.7	9.1	16.8	36.6	14.3	.6	12.0
6	467	100.0	3.4	1.9	2.4	3.9	16.3	31.9	21.6	4.7	13.9
7	104	100.0	3.8	3.8	1.9	9.6	9.6	28.8	15.4	4.8	22.1
9	261	100.0	6.1	5.7	1.5	8.4	21.8	25.3	14.2	1.1	15.7
SMSA											
Chicago	211	100.0	5.7	3.3	2.4	8.5	16.6	34.6	13.3	.5	15.2
Detroit	157	100.0	6.4	3.2	1.3	4.5	19.1	45.8	6.4	---	13.3
Los Angeles	136	100.0	8.8	4.4	3.7	7.4	19.9	24.3	14.0	---	17.6
Newark	80	100.0	5.0	5.0	2.5	11.3	11.3	36.3	13.8	1.3	13.8
New York	305	100.0	4.3	4.6	5.2	15.4	18.4	23.9	8.9	---	19.3
Philadelphia	164	100.0	3.0	2.4	3.0	7.9	19.5	31.7	15.2	.6	16.5
San Francisco	62	100.0	3.2	9.7	1.6	11.3	22.6	19.3	17.7	1.6	12.9
Wash., D.C.	147	100.0	7.5	6.1	1.4	13.6	17.0	18.3	11.6	.7	23.8
Female											
United States	4011	100.0	9.3	1.2	2.1	17.3	1.3	19.5	1.9	3.2	44.2
Region											
1	82	100.0	11.0	2.4	2.4	35.4	1.2	19.5	---	---	28.1
2	504	100.0	8.7	1.2	2.8	27.2	2.0	22.0	1.4	.8	33.9
3	626	100.0	11.3	1.9	1.6	20.1	.8	18.8	1.4	1.1	42.8
4	1154	100.0	9.4	.5	1.2	6.8	1.2	21.0	2.5	8.6	48.9
5	701	100.0	7.8	1.3	3.7	24.7	1.9	20.8	1.9	.4	37.5
6	508	100.0	9.8	.4	2.4	8.1	1.0	14.4	1.6	2.6	59.9
7	130	100.0	6.2	4.6	1.5	20.0	1.5	16.9	3.1	1.6	44.6
9	275	100.0	8.4	1.8	1.5	27.3	.7	19.3	1.8	.7	38.5
SMSA											
Chicago	239	100.0	11.3	.8	6.3	30.5	2.5	25.1	2.1	.4	20.9
Dallas	58	100.0	1.7	3.4	3.4	12.1	---	24.1	1.7	1.7	51.7

Table 5-H. Continued

Detroit	124	100.0	10.5	---	4.0	18.5	3.2	23.4	1.6	---	38.7
Los Angeles	143	100.0	11.2	1.4	2.8	24.5	2.1	23.8	.7	.7	32.9
Newark	83	100.0	4.8	1.2	1.2	27.7	2.4	33.7	1.2	1.2	26.6
New York	352	100.0	9.7	2.3	2.6	28.1	1.1	17.3	.6	---	38.3
Philadelphia	168	100.0	10.1	1.2	2.4	26.8	.6	20.8	.6	.6	36.9
San Francisco	52	100.0	13.5	---	3.8	28.8	1.9	7.7	---	---	44.2
Wash., D.C.	154	100.0	11.0	1.9	3.2	37.0	1.9	5.1	.6	.6	38.3

Table 6-A. Mean Occupation Scores, Mexicans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	33	34	30	21	19	16
Region						
2	44	39	---	32	23	---
3	43	55	41	30	35	---
4	28	40	28	23	18	---
5	32	35	31	25	25	13
6	34	35	30	20	18	15
7	39	36	32	20	20	---
8	32	33	29	23	16	18
9	32	33	30	21	19	17
10	25	23	24	17	16	---
SMSA						
Albuquerque	38	48	---	28	---	---
Anaheim	35	38	28	23	23	15
Brownsville	30	32	26	21	18	16
Chicago	34	37	30	25	23	26
Corpus Christi	34	35	30	20	17	12
Dallas	31	35	34	22	19	13
Denver	36	36	---	22	19	---
Detroit	35	40	33	23	21	---
El Paso	36	37	37	20	17	14
Fresno	26	21	21	16	12	7
Houston	35	36	30	24	19	16
Laredo	29	33	27	22	20	28
Los Angeles	34	35	33	22	22	19
New York	41	33	37	36	27	---
Oxnard	30	32	27	20	12	---
Phoenix	31	33	29	19	16	22
Sacramento	31	35	33	17	22	---
San Antonio	38	37	34	23	20	20
San Bernardino	33	30	29	22	17	19
San Diego	32	34	31	24	17	14
San Francisco	32	34	30	24	26	20
San Jose	35	37	35	23	19	12
Tucson	34	35	30	19	23	---

Table 6-B. Mean Occupation Scores, Puerto Ricans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

Area	Male 20-34	Male 35-49	Male 50-64	Female 20-34	Female 35-49	Female 50-64
United States	.32	.31	.28	.24	.22	.20
Region						
1	.30	.36	---	.24	.22	---
2	.32	.31	.28	.23	.20	.19
3	.30	.26	.34	.21	.23	.26
4	.33	.34	.29	.19	.36	.15
5	.31	.30	.28	.28	.23	---
9	.40	.32	.34	.24	.22	.26
SMSA						
Chicago	.31	.31	.25	.22	.23	---
Jersey City	.29	.26	.25	.21	.15	---
Los Angeles	.38	.33	---	.31	.20	---
Miami	.26	.26	---	.28	.22	---
Newark	.32	.32	---	.23	.17	---
New York	.32	.31	.26	.23	.20	.18
Philadelphia	.32	.32	.36	.16	.24	---
San Francisco	.38	.40	---	.28	---	---

Table 6-C. Mean Occupation Scores, Cubans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Age, 1970

		Male			Female	
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.40	.38	.36	.24	.23	.18
Region						
1	.38	.44	---	.27	.20	---
2	.37	.34	.34	.25	.24	.18
3	.53	.41	---	.25	.28	---
4	.40	.38	.36	.23	.20	.17
5	.43	.39	.44	.26	.28	.26
6	---	.58	---	---	---	---
9	.40	.35	.28	.24	.27	.23
SMSA						
Chicago	.40	.41	.37	.26	.23	.20
Jersey City	.32	.34	.28	.26	.23	.14
Los Angeles	.40	.38	.30	.22	.21	---
Miami	.38	.38	.35	.23	.19	.19
Newark	.33	.34	.33	.23	.23	---
New York	.40	.34	.32	.25	.29	.17
Philadelphia	---	---	---	---	---	---

Table 6-D. Mean Occupation Scores, Indians,by Region, Sex and Age, 1970

Area	Male 20-34	Male 35-49	Male 50-64	Female 20-34	Female 35-49	Female 50-64
United States	.35	.35	.33	.23	.22	.23
Region						
1	.42	.44	.28	.28	.26	---
2	.36	.40	.34	.30	.28	.22
3	.42	.38	.36	.26	.32	.25
4	.36	.32	.30	.22	.19	.26
5	.36	.35	.34	.25	.25	.22
6	.36	.35	.32	.21	.22	.25
7	.36	.35	.32	.22	.20	.20
8	.35	.34	.34	.27	.21	.20
9	.34	.34	.34	.21	.20	.21
10	.32	.34	.34	.22	.22	.25

Table 6-E. Mean Occupation Scores, Japanese, by Regions, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.49	.49	.41	.35	.27	.25
Region						
1	---	---	---	.33*	.30*	---
2	.60	.55	.44*	.34	.29	.38*
3	---	.65*	---	.40*	.24	---
4	---	---	---	.24*	.21	---
5	.57	.58	.48	.39	.28	.30*
6	---	---	---	.28*	.19*	---
7	---	---	---	---	.24*	---
8	.34*	.48*	---	.32*	.27	---
9	.47	.48	.39	.35	.28	.24
10	.49	.49	.43	.36	.24	.27*
SMSA						
Boston	---	---	---	---	---	---
Chicago	.52	.44	.37	.46	.39	.34*
Honolulu	.46	.47	.42	.32	.30	.22
Los Angeles	.49	.52	.35	.36	.24	.29
New York	.50	.50	---	.45	---	---
San Francisco	.46	.52	.41	.35	.27	.22*
San Jose	.53	.52	.42*	.41	.24	---
Seattle	.46*	.57*	.44*	.52*	.26	---

Table 6-F. Mean Occupation Scores, Chinese, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.48	.46	.35	.36	.28	.24
Region						
1	.53	.40*	.27*	.38*	.30*	---
2	.45	.36	.27	.32	.26	.20
3	.58*	.52	.48*	.39	.45*	.42*
4	.53	.60*	---	.40*	---	---
5	.58	.50*	.35	.47	.42	.35*
6	.53	.44	---	---	---	---
7	.54*	---	---	.51*	---	---
8	.51	---	---	---	---	---
9	.45	.48	.37	.34	.26	.23
10	.38*	.46*	.28*	.39*	---	---
SMSA						
Boston	.48	.34*	.29*	.27	---	---
Chicago	.58	.32	.26*	.35	.25*	---
Honolulu	.48	.51	.49	.36	.33	.33
Los Angeles	.60	.44	.38	.40	.25	.19*
New York	.38	.28	.24	.30	.19	.16
San Francisco	.41	.42	.29	.32	.25	.13
San Jose	.49*	.63*	---	.35*	---	---
Wash., D.C.	.65	---	---	.47*	---	---

Table 6-G. Mean Occupation Scores, Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	44	46	24	36	30	28
Region						
2	61	61*	31*	48	43	---
3	66	68*	---	47	33*	---
5	62	68	33*	48	45	---
9	37	39	23	28	27	24
10	46*	50*	24*	27	19*	---
SMSA						
Chicago	64	64*	---	46	43*	---
Honolulu	34	36	24	24	22	19
Los Angeles	44	45	25*	37	33	---
New York	58	---	34	49	---	---
San Francisco	36	44	29	30	32	31*
Seattle	39*	---	26*	---	---	---

Table 6-H. Mean Occupation Scores of Blacks by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.33	.33	.29	.23	.20	.16
Region						
1	.38*	.39*	---	.29	.27*	---
2	.35	.34	.30	.24	.23	.21
3	.33	.33	.32	.26	.22	.15
4	.30	.30	.26	.19	.17	.13
5	.34	.34	.32	.24	.20	.20
6	.32	.33	.28	.20	.16	.15
7	.30	.34	.28	.26	.20	.16*
9	.37	.37	.30	.28	.21	.16
SMSA						
Chicago	.35	.34	.33	.28	.26	.23
Dallas	.32*	---	---	.17*	---	.16*
Detroit	.31	.36	.35	.25	.19	.21
Los Angeles	.36	.35	.34*	.28	.23	.18*
Miami	---	---	---	---	.13*	---
Newark	.30	.34*	.31*	.28*	.20	.15*
New York	.36	.33	.28	.26	.23	.15
Philadelphia	.29	.30	.30	.25	.22	.19
San Francisco	.40*	.36*	.30*	.28*	---	---
Wash., D.C.	.35	.40	.32	.28	.21	.22

Table 7-A. Mean Occupation Scores, Mexicans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Education, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.29	.37	.51	.16	.23	.37
Region						
2	.30*	---	---	.25*	.24*	---
3	.32*	---	---	.23*	.25*	---
4	.23	---	---	.14*	---	---
5	.31	.37	.45	.21	.26	.42
6	.30	.40	.54	.14	.24	.41
7	.33	.38*	---	.18	.20	---
8	.28	.31	.51*	.14	.24	---
9	.28	.36	.48	.16	.22	.33
10	.21	---	---	.15	.15*	---
SMSA						
Albuquerque	.28*	---	---	---	.23*	---
Anaheim	.30	.37	.51*	.18	.24	.35*
Brownsville	.27	.35	.57*	.13	.26	.52*
Chicago	.32	.39	.53*	.23	.27	.31*
Corpus Christi	.31	.40	.46*	.14	.26*	---
Dallas	.31	.36*	---	.18	.24*	---
Denver	.33	.36*	---	.18	.28*	---
Detroit	.32	.36*	---	.20*	.27*	---
El Paso	.33	.43	.52*	.14	.20	.50*
Fresno	.20	.28*	---	.11	.17*	---
Houston	.32	.36	.51*	.18	.25	.37*
Laredo	.25	.39	.53	.15	.25	.48*
Los Angeles	.30	.35	.51	.18	.24	.36
New York	.29*	---	---	---	---	---
Oxnard	.25	.37*	---	.13	.22*	---
Phoenix	.28	.38	---	.15	.24*	---
Sacramento	.31	.35*	---	.14	.22*	---
San Antonio	.34	.40	.55	.16	.26	.46
San Bernardino	.26	.34	.48	.15	.21	.36*
San Diego	.27	.36	.44*	.16	.27	---
San Francisco	.29	.33	.44	.19	.23	.41
San Jose	.32	.36	.54*	.17	.26	---
Tucson	.30	.35	.45*	.17	.22	---

Table 7-B. Mean Occupation Scores, Puerto Ricans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Education, 1970

	Male			Female		
Area	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.28	.35	.51	.18	.25	.44
Region						
1	.30	.34	---	.21	.21	---
2	.28	.35	.51	.18	.25	.42
3	.26	.34	---	.12	.30	.43
4	.28	.40	---	.15	.30	---
5	.29	.36	.36	.24	.26	.50
6	---	---	---	.21	---	---
9	.29	.41	.52	.17	.24	.48
SMSA						
Chicago	.28	.36	.47	.21	.22	---
Jersey City	.24	.36	---	.17	.19	---
Los Angeles	.30	.38	---	.22	.34	---
Miami	.17	---	---	.11	.25	---
Newark	.32	---	---	.19	---	---
New York	.28	.35	.50	.18	.24	.32
Philadelphia	.28	.34	---	.19	---	---

Table 7-C. Mean Occupation Scores, Cubans, by Region, SMSA, Sex and Education, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.30	.36	.52	.16	.23	.34
Region						
1	.27	---	.53	---	.21	---
2	.28	.34	.54	.17	.22	.42
3	.27	.34	.62	.12	.24	.37
4	.32	.37	.51	.15	.23	.28
5	.31	.39	.58	.21	.21	.44
6	---	---	.67	---	---	---
9	.28	.40	.40	.19	.23	.33
SMSA						
Chicago	.30	---	.52	.22	.26	.24
Jersey City	.28	.34	.50	.18	.27	---
Los Angeles	.30	.37	.43	.14	.19	.28
Miami	.31	.37	.51	.14	.20	.34
Newark	.32	.37	---	.22	---	---
New York	.28	.34	.56	.16	.26	.43

Table 7-D. Mean Occupation Scores, Indians, by Regions, Sex and Education, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.30	.35	.50	.17	.23	.38
Region						
1	.30	---	.56	.10	.25	---
2	.32	.40	.46	.19	.26	.50
3	.30	.39	.59	.19	.26	.57
4	.30	.36	.50	.16	.26	.40
5	.30	.37	.52	.20	.23	.40
6	.30	.36	.49	.16	.22	.41
7	.27	.34	.54	.17	.25	.20
8	.30	.34	.50	.19	.26	.39
9	.29	.34	.48	.17	.20	.34
10	.31	.32	.42	.18	.24	.30

Table 7-E. Mean Occupation Scores, Japanese, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.33	.40	.58	.16	.25	.42
Region						
1	---	---	---	---	.24*	---
2	---	.42*	.65	.18*	.24	.44
3	---	---	.76*	.15*	.23*	.48*
4	---	---	.66*	.16*	.17*	.38*
5	.34*	.43	.67	.19*	.25	.44
6	---	---	.72*	---	.21*	.29*
8	---	.38*	.44	---	.19	.40
9	.33	.41	.56	.16	.25	.43
10	---	.37	.57	.12*	.25	.41
SMSA						
Chicago	.34*	.37	.53	---	.32	.53
Honolulu	.37	.43	.56	.17	.26	.44
Los Angeles	.30	.39	.57	.12	.24	.42
New York	---	.38*	.57	---	.26*	.51
San Francisco	.29*	.37	.56	.11*	.24	.41
San Jose	---	.43	.59	---	.22	.42
Seattle	---	.40*	.59	---	.27	.46

Table 7-F. Mean Occupation Scores, Chinese, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

United States	.21	.34	.61	.13	.28	.46
Region						
1	.18	.25*	.70	.12*	---	.49*
2	.15	.27	.65	.11	.28	.46
3	.24*	---	.68	.15*	.31*	.53
4	.30*	---	.71	---	---	.50*
5	.18	.27*	.66	.20	.23*	.56
6	---	---	.59	---	---	.43*
7	---	---	.61	---	---	.60*
8	---	---	.63*	---	---	---
9	.26	.37	.57	.13	.27	.42
10	.18*	---	.52	---	---	.39*
SMSA						
Boston	.17	---	.57	.07*	---	.40
Chicago	.18	---	.63	.13*	---	.47
Honolulu	.34	.46	.60	.17	.28	.51
Los Angeles	.24	.31	.65	.10	.24	.46
New York	.16	.25	.56	.10	.23	.41
San Francisco	.20	.35	.52	.12	.26	.37
San Jose	---	---	.60	---	---	.40*
Wash., D.C.	---	---	.69	---	---	.55*

Table 7-G. Mean Occupation Scores, Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	24	34	56	18	22	44
Region						
2	27	---	70	23	---	53
3	---	---	71	---	22*	52
5	---	---	66	23*	---	53
9	24	33	46	17	21	36
10	22	---	62*	---	---	31
SMSA						
Chicago	---	59	65	---	---	48
Honolulu	26	37	41	16	22	33
Los Angeles	22*	30	49	20*	21*	41
New York	33*	---	60	---	---	54
San Francisco	24	28	45	22	23	37
Seattle	25*	---	---	---	---	---

Table 7-H. Mean Occupation Scores of Blacks, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex, 1970

Area	Male Less than H.S. 12	Male H.S. 12	Male College 1 or more	Female Less than H.S. 12	Female H.S. 12	Female College 1 or more
United States	.28	.33	.49	.12	.22	.46
Region						
1	.34*	.36*	---	.17	.28	---
2	.28	.34	.52	.15	.26	.43
3	.29	.34	.49	.13	.23	.48
4	.26	.30	.51	.10	.18	.56
5	.30	.33	.47	.15	.22	.41
6	.28	.33	.56*	.11	.1[illegible]	.47
7	.26	.29	---	.15	.21	.46*
9	.28	.36	.45	.15	.23	.38
SMSA						
Chicago	.30	.33	.51	.19	.25	.44
Dallas	.28*	---	---	.10	---	---
Detroit	.30	.32	.50*	.13	.27	.40
Los Angeles	.29	.34	.44	.15	.22	.38
Miami	.27*	---	---	.08	---	---
Newark	.29	.32*	---	.17	.24*	---
New York	.28	.36	.48	.15	.24	.38
Philadelphia	.28	.32	---	.16	.23	---
San Francisco	.32*	.36*	.41*	.13	---	.35*
Wash., D.C.	.29	.36	.56*	.14	.27	.41

Table 8-A. Occupational Mobility of Mexicans, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1965-70

Area	Proportion mobile		Proportion of movers upwardly mobile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.38	.38	.59	.51
Region				
2	.32	.38*	---	---
3	.29	.44*	---	---
4	.42	.46*	.64*	---
5	.42	.44	.60	.66
6	.38	.38	.59	.47
7	.34	.38	.61	.50*
8	.53	.41	.54	.36*
9	.38	.37	.60	.52
10	.43	.28*	.58	---
SMSA				
Albuquerque	.31*	---	---	---
Anaheim	.38	.45	.68	.48*
Brownsville	.40	.32	.55	.51
Chicago	.43	.38	.61	.48
Corpus Christi	.39	.31	.50	---
Dallas	.44	.46	.57	.38*
Denver	.50	.30*	.55*	---
Detroit	.46	.26*	.68*	---
El Paso	.35	.23	.55	.32*
Fresno	.33	.44	.64	.38*
Houston	.44	.41	.64	.39
Laredo	.37	.36	.57	.43*
Los Angeles	.38	.35	.56	.57
New York	.36	---	---	---
Oxnard	.32	.32	.58*	---
Phoenix	.42	.53	.73	.54*
Sacramento	.39	.22*	.62*	---
San Antonio	.38	.34	.56	.51
San Bernardino	.39	.30	.57	.48*
San Diego	.40	.28	.65	.31*
San Francisco	.41	.38	.59	.40
San Jose	.44	.45	.69	.38*
Tucson	.38	.44*	.67*	---

Table 8-B. Occupational Mobility of Puerto Ricans, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1965-70

Area	Proportion mobile		Proportion of movers upwardly mobile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.40	.35	.57	.49
Region				
1	.63	.48	.62	---
2	.39	.32	.54	.48
3	.37	.40	.64*	.39*
4	.39	.43*	.91*	---
5	.42	.44	.60	.46
9	.44	.48	.60	.55*
SMSA				
Chicago	.51	.40	.52	.24*
Jersey City	.32	.35*	.43*	---
Los Angeles	.38	.19*	---	---
Miami	.41*	.35*	---	---
Newark	.32	---	---	---
New York	.38	.30	.54	.46
Philadelphia	.47	.31*	.67*	---
San Francisco	.56*	---	---	---

Table 8-C. Occupational Mobility of Cubans, by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1965-70

Area	Proportion mobile		Proportion of movers upwardly mobile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.52	.39	.52	.48
Region				
1	.55*	---	---	---
2	.47	.38	.48	.54
3	.26	.29*	---	---
4	.54	.37	.56	.41
5	.66	.48*	.43	---
6	.60*	---	---	---
9	.60	.40	.49	.67*
SMSA				
Chicago	.63	.47*	.46*	---
Jersey City	.56	.47	.51	.52*
Los Angeles	.59	.51	.54	.45*
Miami	.50	.35	.56	.59
Newark	.33*	---	---	---
New York	.43	.35	.52	.43

Table 8-D. Occupational Mobility of Indians by Region and Sex, 1965-70

Area	Proportion mobile		Proportion of movers upwardly mobile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.44	.43	.59	.49
Region				
1	.31*	---	---	---
2	.25	.35*	---	---
3	.33*	.25*	---	---
4	.28	.51	.52*	.42*
5	.44	.47	.61	.58*
6	.47	.45	.65	.60
7	.59	---	.55*	---
8	.49	.49	.68	.58*
9	.46	.43	.50	.39
10	.54	.39	.58	---

Table 8-E. Occupational Mobility of Japanese, by Regions, SMSA and Sex, 1965-70

Area	Proportion mobile		Proportion of movers upwardly mobile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.30	.33	.58	.47
Region				
2	.42	.39	.63*	---
3	---	.31*	---	---
5	.29	.20	.75*	---
8	.35*	.39*	---	---
9	.29	.32	.55	.46
10	.31	.43	.73*	.53*
SMSA				
Chicago	.35	.33	---	---
Honolulu	.25	.37	.62	.49
Los Angeles	.32	.28	.43	.40
New York	.31*	.12*	---	---
San Francisco	.29	.30	.63*	---
San Jose	.50	.35*	.50*	---
Seattle	.31*	.35*	---	---

Table 8-F. Occupational Mobility of Chinese, by Regions, SMSA and Sex, 1965-70

Area	Proportion mobile		Proportion of movers upwardly mobile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.31	.29	.52	.41
Region				
1	.41*	---	---	---
2	.28	.30	.54	.39*
3	.23*	---	---	---
5	.34	.27*	.41*	---
6	.31*	---	---	---
9	.33	.30	.50	.41
10	.44*	---	---	---
SMSA				
Boston	.18*	---	---	---
Chicago	.29*	---	---	---
Honolulu	.38	.27	.62	.49
Los Angeles	.30	.26	.43	.40
New York	.24	.26	---	---
San Francisco	.36	.21	.63*	---
San Jose	.29*	---	.50*	---

Table 8-G. Occupational Mobility of Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, and Sex, 1970

Area	Proportion mobile		Proportion of movers upwardly mobile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.34	.38	.52	.32
Region				
2	.42#	.48#	---	---
3	.12#	.30#	---	---
5	.50	.47#	.58#	---
9	.33	.33	.52	.30
10	.39#	---	---	---
SMSA				
Chicago	.18#	.68#	---	---
Honolulu	.26	.42	.64	.32#
Los Angeles	.55	.49	.41#	.27#
New York	.21#	---	---	---
San Francisco	.48	.39	.43#	.35#

Table 8-H. Occupational Mobility of Blacks, by Region, SMSA, and Sex, 1965-70

Area	Proportion mobile		Proportion of movers upwardly mobile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.36	.33	.59	.58
Region				
1	.37	.47	.82*	.71*
2	.34	.32	.62	.64
3	.37	.30	.56	.57
4	.36	.33	.54	.55
5	.38	.38	.63	.59
6	.38	.30	.58	.58
7	.33	.40	.54*	.68*
9	.36	.32	.66	.56
SMSA				
Chicago	.42	.36	.61	.43
Dallas	.50*	.50*	---	---
Detroit	.34	.38	.77	.54*
Los Angeles	.36	.37	.61	.57*
Miami	.38*	.25*	---	---
Newark	.42	.40	.54	.65*
New York	.28	.30	.60	.58
Philadelphia	.29	.37	.50*	.70
San Francisco	.30	.32	---	---
Wash., D.C.	.34	.40	.61	.37

Table 9-A. Earnings in 1969 of Mexicans, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.70	.79	.68	.37	.41	.32
Region						
2	1.00*	1.00*	---	.69*	---	---
4	.63	.61*	---	---	---	---
5	.75	.88	.82	.51	.60	.50*
6	.62	.69	.54	.28	.32	.18
7	.77	.93	.82*	.30	.52*	---
8	.63	.83	.80	.33	.38	---
9	.76	.84	.78	.42	.45	.42
10	.62	.60*	.76*	.21*	---	---
SMSA						
Albuquerque	---	---	---	---	---	---
Anaheim	.83	.90	.79	.27	.44*	---
Brownsville	.52	.58	.30	.17	.12	.18*
Chicago	.80	.91	.93*	.54	.67	---
Corpus Christi	.62	.74	.52	.19*	.25*	---
Dallas	.76	.85*	.61*	.44	---	---
Denver	.76	.83*	---	.39*	---	---
Detroit	.92*	.88*	---	---	---	---
El Paso	.81	.78	.65	.33	.32	.30*
Fresno	.55	.66	.50*	.42*	---	---
Houston	.75	.83	.81	.38	.39	---
Laredo	.37	.51	.32	.28	.30	.35*
Los Angeles	.79	.84	.80	.47	.48	.57
New York	.81*	.88*	---	---	---	---
Oxnard	.80	.72	.65*	.44*	---	---
Phoenix	.69	.78	.59*	.31	.32*	---
Sacramento	.77	.80*	---	---	---	---
San Antonio	.72	.79	.75	.43	.43	.22
San Bernardino	.79	.82	.76	.39	.38	---
San Diego	.68	.80	.79*	.34	.46*	.38*
San Francisco	.75	.93	.80	.51	.64	.74*
San Jose	.82	.87	.89*	.54	.50*	---
Tucson	.79	.88	.75*	.30*	---	---

Table 9-B. Earnings in 1969 of Puerto Ricans, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.76	.85	.74	.54	.62	.50
Region						
1	.69	.85*	---	.29	---	---
2	.76	.85	.73	.59	.65	.51
3	.68	.79*	---	.50	.65*	---
4	.61	.82*	---	.30*	.42*	---
5	.81	.90	.83*	.42	.67*	---
9	.74	.89	---	.58	.44*	---
SMSA						
Chicago	.78	.86	.89*	.39	.67*	---
Jersey City	.81	.76*	---	.54*	---	---
Los Angeles	---	.94*	---	---	---	---
Newark	.94	.70*	---	---	---	---
New York	.79	.83	.84	.56	.55	.56
Philadelphia	.63	.76*	---	---	---	---

Table 9-C. Earnings in 1969 of Cubans, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3, 500 Male 20-34	35-49	50-64	Female 20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.82	.78	.71	.49	.54	.45
Region						
2	.86	.80	.70	.54	.65	.55
3	---	.68*	---	---	---	---
4	.80	.73	.68	.45	.43	.37
5	1.00*	.83*	.71*	---	.74*	.61*
9	.74	.85	.83*	.50*	.58	---
SMSA						
Chicago	.79*	.75*	---	---	.60*	---
Jersey City	.82*	.91	.90*	.57*	.55	---
Los Angeles	.79	.79	.76*	.44*	.43	---
Miami	.74	.69	.59	.39	.39	.35
Newark	---	.81*	---	---	---	---
New York	.77	.86	.82	.64	.61	.67

Table 9-D. Earnings in 1969 of Indians, by Region, Age and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.62	.70	.60	.36	.42	.37
Region						
1	---	.81*	---	.25*	---	---
2	.58	.78	.84*	.55*	.50*	---
3	.71	.81*	---	.44*	.56*	---
4	.53	.57	.34	.19	.33	.20*
5	.69	.81	.78	.40	.49	.42*
6	.58	.67	.55	.33	.39	.35
7	.76	.62	.55*	.25*	---	---
8	.56	.57	.55*	.35	.36	.33*
9	.65	.72	.75	.44	.45	.36
10	.67	.82	.54*	.34	.48	.54*

Table 9-E. Earnings in 1969 of Japanese, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.70	.83	.73	.57	.58	.60
Region						
2	.80	.96	---	.48*	.57	.72*
3	---	---	---	---	.48*	---
4	---	---	---	---	.35*	---
5	.65	.90	.87	.52*	.63	.79*
6	---	---	---	---	.61*	---
8	---	.73*	---	.45*	.47	---
9	.72	.83	.72	.60	.60	.60
10	.56	.71	.62	.48*	.58	.52*
SMSA						
Chicago	.52	.78	.88	.59*	.67	.67*
Honolulu	.76	.93	.88	.62	.68	.56
Los Angeles	.71	.74	.59	.67	.62	.71
New York	.84	.93*	---	.70*	---	---
San Francisco	.68	.89	.54	.57	.63	.50*
San Jose	.86*	.84	.62*	.50*	.59*	---
Seattle	.53*	.96	.78*	.80*	.40*	---

Table 9-F. Earnings in 1969 of Chinese, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.63	.76	.66	.50	.53	.45
Region						
1	.52	.70*	---	.39*	---	---
2	.68	.74	.62	.48	.57	.40
3	.64	.86*	.71*	.58*	.48*	---
4	.42*	.84*	---	---	---	---
5	.61	.81	.69	.52	.46*	---
6	.61*	.67	---	---	---	---
7	.39	---	---	---	---	---
9	.65	.78	.71	.51	.52	.48
10	.51*	.64*	.53*	---	---	---
SMSA						
Boston	.62	.58*	.25*	.42*	---	---
Chicago	.64	.85	.55*	.71*	.44*	---
Honolulu	.72	.94	.75	.57	.76	.67
Los Angeles	.67	.74	.64	.38	.52	.28*
New York	.65	.64	.65	.55	.58	.46
San Francisco	.62	.74	.68	.52	.53	.30
San Jose	---	.88*	.57	---	---	---

Table 9-G. Earnings in 1969 of Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex

Area	Male 20-34	35-49	50-64	Female 20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	71	83	79	55	57	56
Region						
2	69	74*	---	64	67*	---
3	81	---	---	61	---	---
5	85	79	81*	66	67*	---
9	70	85	80	47	58	59
10	75*	---	67*	35*	---	---
SMSA						
Chicago	72	76*	---	63	---	---
Honolulu	84	87	87	44	48	38
Los Angeles	70	87	83*	62	63	---
New York	83	---	---	86	---	---
San Francisco	75	78	75	54	67	---
Seattle	---	---	84*	---	---	---

Table 9-H. Earnings in 1969 of Blacks, by Region, SMSA, Age and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	20-34	35-49	50-64	20-34	35-49	50-64
United States	.70	.74	.69	.43	.43	.35
Region						
1	.87*	.94*	---	.44	.82*	.38*
2	.85	.82	.84	.66	.65	.59
3	.75	.77	.74	.53	.48	.38
4	.57	.59	.50	.27	.24	.18
5	.77	.83	.87	.47	.57	.52
6	.66	.70	.54	.24	.26	.20
7	.68*	.79	.73*	.59	.47	.29*
9	.77	.80	.90	.54	.50	.50
SMSA						
Chicago	.83	.88	.97	.68	.66	.48*
Dallas	.74*	---	---	.36*	---	---
Detroit	.80	.92	.87	.63	.61	.39*
Los Angeles	.79	.67	.81*	.50	.68*	---
Miami	---	---	---	---	.25*	---
Newark	.77	.91*	---	.78*	.52*	---
New York	.77	.86	.94	.73	.67	.58
Philadelphia	.67	.87	.85	.51	.47	.47*
San Francisco	.67*	---	---	.59*	---	---
Wash., D.C.	.74	.93	.77*	.76	.61	.44

Table 10-A. Earnings in 1969 of Mexicans, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.70	.80	.80	.28	.48	.63
Region						
2	1.00*	---	---	---	.74*	---
3	1.00*	---	---	---	---	---
4	.54	---	---	.12*	---	---
5	.80	.88	.78	.51	.55	.83*
6	.59	.74	.78	.17	.40	.68
7	.86	.88*	---	.27*	.35*	---
8	.78	.65	.68*	.28	.43	---
9	.78	.84	.81	.36	.51	.58
10	.60	---	---	0*	---	---
SMSA						
Albuquerque	.47*	---	---	---	---	---
Anaheim	.80	.91	.93*	.29	.29*	---
Brownsville	.42	.69	.63*	.05	.31	.42*
Chicago	.86	.89	.71*	.56	.63*	---
Corpus Christi	.63	.70	---	.12	---	---
Dallas	.75	.74*	---	.29	---	---
Denver	.76	.91*	---	---	.41*	---
Detroit	.92*	.88*	---	---	---	---
El Paso	.70	.91	.88*	.25	.33	---
Fresno	.55	.64*	---	.29*	---	---
Houston	.78	.77	.82*	.30	.42	---
Laredo	.33	.54	.72*	.18	.32	.63*
Los Angeles	.78	.84	.90	.41	.57	.62
New York	.83*	---	---	---	---	---
Oxnard	.71	.83*	---	.33*	---	---
Phoenix	.68	.83*	---	.32	---	---
Sacramento	.77	.88*	---	---	---	---
San Antonio	.73	.78	.88	.30	.47	.83*
San Bernardino	.78	.91	.67*	.29	.56*	.50*
San Diego	.70	.77	.79*	.40	.38*	---
San Francisco	.83	.82	.83	.58	.59	.61*
San Jose	.81	.92	.86*	.41	.56*	---
Tucson	.76	.86*	.94*	.24*	.50*	---

Table 10-B. Earnings in 1969 of Puerto Ricans, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.76	.84	.84	.50	.59	.78
Region						
1	.69	.78	---	.38	---	---
2	.76	.85	.89	.55	.62	.89
3	.72	---	---	.43	.69*	---
4	.56	---	---	.10*	.65*	---
5	.85	.86	---	.46	.43*	---
9	.86	.78	.71*	.38*	.60*	---
SMSA						
Chicago	.80	.86*	---	.50	.58*	---
Jersey City	.75	---	---	.40*	---	---
Los Angeles	.90	---	---	---	---	---
Newark	.85	---	---	---	---	---
New York	.80	.86	.80	.50	.62	.66
Philadelphia	.71	---	---	---	---	---

Table 10-C. Earnings in 1969 of Cubans, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.71	.82	.85	.40	.58	.61
Region						
2	.74	.84	.88	.53	.60	.77
3	---	---	.88*	---	---	---
4	.66	.81	.82	.27	.58	.53
5	.80*	---	.82*	.57*	---	.82*
6	---	---	.94*	---	---	---
9	.86	.74*	.84	.62*	.50*	.52*
SMSA						
Chicago	.74*	---	.68*	.75*	.62*	---
Jersey City	.88	1.00*	---	.39	.62*	---
Los Angeles	.65	.84*	.89	.36*	.44*	---
Miami	.60	.74	.76	.29	.38	.56
Newark	.76*	---	---	.48	---	---
New York	.74	.86	.96	.52	.76	.74

Table 10-D. Earnings in 1969 of Indians, by Region, Education and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.57	.75	.71	.26	.41	.58
Region						
1	.47*	---	---	---	---	---
2	.65	.79*	.81*	.35*	.59*	---
3	.63	---	.78*	.25*	.50*	---
4	.40	.76	.60*	.21	.15	.53
5	.73	.82	.63	.31	.50	.55
6	.53	.70	.68	.22	.38	.62
7	.51	.81*	---	---	.36*	---
8	.52	.64	.59	.26	.44	.45*
9	.62	.76	.74	.29	.46	.58
10	.68	.71	.81*	.33	.43*	.58*

Table 10-E. Earnings in 1969 of Japanese, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex

	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
Area	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.77	.77	.76	.44	.62	.62
Region						
2	---	.78*	.90	.41*	.57	.65
3	---	---	.92*	.38*	---	---
5	.68*	.88	.82	.67*	.63	.62
8	---	.71*	.56*	---	.42*	.56*
9	.78	.78	.75	.47	.64	.63
10	---	.65	.63	---	.60	.50
SMSA						
Boston	---	---	.94*	---	---	---
Chicago	.71*	.73	.72	---	.48	.73*
Honolulu	.88	.89	.79	.50	.69	.66
Los Angeles	.51	.66	.78	.52	.66	.69
New York	---	.82*	.91	---	---	.81*
San Francisco	.75	.70	.78	.53*	.55	.62
San Jose	---	.76*	.88	---	.47*	.59*
Seattle	---	.82*	.76	---	.54*	.69*

Table 10-F. Earnings in 1969 of Chinese, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.59	.72	.73	.31	.61	.68
Region						
1	.42*	---	.69	---	---	.44*
2	.61	.60	.83	.35	.67	.61
3	.50*	---	.80	---	---	.66
4	---	---	.78*	---	---	---
5	.60	.55*	.73	.43*	---	.58
6	---	---	.65*	---	---	---
7	---	---	.45	---	---	---
9	.63	.78	.73	.30	.62	.57
10	.45*	---	.59	---	---	---
SMSA						
Boston	.44	---	.61	.32*	---	---
Chicago	.71	.87*	.64	.40*	---	.61*
Honolulu	.81	.87	.77	.61	.73	.61
Los Angeles	.60	.62	.75	.17	.55*	.53
New York	.57	.71	.72	.44	.58	.65
San Francisco	.61	.77	.70	.27	.58	.59
San Jose	---	---	.73*	---	---	---

Table 10-G. Earnings in 1969 of Filipinos, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex

Area	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	77	80	75	44	46	63
Region						
2	47*	---	78	33*	---	69
3	---	---	85	---	---	58
5	---	---	82	---	---	69
9	80	81	72	47	45	60
10	67*	---	85*	---	---	50*
SMSA						
Chicago	---	---	73	---	---	65
Honolulu	86	89	78	31	58	50
Los Angeles	75*	78	80	---	---	57
New York	---	---	88	---	---	83
San Francisco	77	83	73	44*	45	67
Seattle	73	---	---	---	---	---

Table 10-H. Earnings in 1969 of Blacks, by Region, SMSA, Education and Sex

	Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500					
	Male			Female		
Area	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more	Less than H.S. 12	H.S. 12	College 1 or more
United States	.66	.77	.84	.25	.49	.73
Region						
1	.81*	.92*	---	.35*	.61*	---
2	.84	.82	.88	.55	.68	.74
3	.73	.79	.85	.32	.57	.70
4	.48	.70	.81	.11	.29	.72
5	.82	.79	.88	.41	.54	.74
6	.60	.73	.76*	.10	.23	.72
7	.64	.77*	---	.33	.56	---
9	.81	.81	.79	.19	.60	.78
SMSA						
Chicago	.90	.80	.91	.48	.72	.75
Dallas	.64*	---	---	.15*	---	---
Detroit	.86	.84	.91*	.44	.61	---
Los Angeles	.69	.71	.84	.34*	.48	.83
Miami	.72*	---	---	.16*	---	---
Newark	.83	.88*	---	.52	.74*	---
New York	.84	.80	.94	.61	.69	.79
Philadelphia	.75	.84	---	.32	.62	---
San Francisco	.94*	.81*	---	---	---	---
Wash., D.C.	.78	.85	.82*	.46	.65	.88*

Table 11-A. Weeks Worked and Earnings in 1969 for Mexicans, by Region, SMSA and Sex

Area	Proportion who worked 48-52 weeks		Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500 worked			
			Less than 48 weeks		48-52 weeks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.76	.46	.46	.18	.82	.56
Region						
2	.87	.55	---	---	1.00	.80*
3	.86	.46*	---	---	.97	---
4	.64	.32	.29*	---	.80	---
5	.78	.49	.56	.30	.90	.76
6	.79	.51	.31	.13	.70	.41
7	.82	.55	---	.06*	.88	.51
8	.77	.42	.38	.03	.85	.67
9	.73	.43	.54	.20	.88	.66
10	.63	.28	.26*	.06*	.79	---
SMSA						
Albuquerque	.77	.41*	---	---	.79*	---
Anaheim	.78	.38	.69	.15	.92	.56
Brownsville	.70	.43	.25	.09	.56	.23
Chicago	.78	.54	.63	.25	.94	.79
Corpus Christi	.82	.53	.30*	---	.74	.35
Dallas	.79	.44	.41*	.05*	.86	.75*
Denver	.76	.41	---	---	.90	---
Detroit	.78	.54	---	---	.95	.59*
El Paso	.85	.58	.43*	.22	.82	.40
Fresno	.61	.25	.47	.06*	.66	.55*
Houston	.83	.48	.37	.09	.88	.59
Laredo	.64	.52	.24	.14	.49	.43
Los Angeles	.75	.51	.62	.26	.90	.68
New York	.77	.56*	---	---	.91	---
Oxnard	.75	.26	.42*	.18*	.83	.69*
Phoenix	.79	.36	.46*	.16	.79	.55*
Sacramento	.74	.21	---	---	.88	---
San Antonio	.82	.52	.41	.18	.82	.54
San Bernardino	.76	.41	.60	.24	.87	.58
San Diego	.76	.48	.52	.06	.81	.64
San Francisco	.71	.49	.69	.34	.89	.83
San Jose	.75	.35	.60	.31*	.91	.71
Tucson	.82	.41	.44*	---	.89	.67*

Table 11-B. Weeks Worked and Earnings in 1969 for Puerto Ricans, by Region, SMSA and Sex

Area	Proportion who worked 48-52 weeks		Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500 worked			
			Less than 48 weeks		48-52 weeks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.78	.56	.55	.33	.87	.76
Region						
1	.76	.43	.62*	.11*	.78	.65*
2	.78	.58	.55	.41	.88	.77
3	.81	.63	.47*	.25*	.80	.76
4	.75	.48	---	.06*	.80	.70*
5	.79	.50	.65	.21	.90	.71
6	.87*	---	---	---	---	---
9	.80	.49	.59*	.21*	.85	.81
10	.79	---	---	---	---	---
SMSA						
Chicago	.83	.57	.76*	.43*	.86	.62
Jersey City	.68	.30	.67*	.39*	.83	---
Los Angeles	.71	.44*	---	---	.93*	---
Miami	.73*	.54*	---	---	.90*	---
Newark	.76	.46*	---	---	.89	---
New York	.78	.58	.65	.30	.87	.74
Philadelphia	.70	.47*	.40*	---	.82	---
San Francisco	.70	.58*	---	---	.91*	---

Table 11-C. Weeks Worked and Earnings in 1969 for Cubans, by Region, SMSA and Sex

Area	Proportion who worked 48-52 weeks		Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500 worked			
			Less than 48 weeks		48-52 weeks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.78	.54	.49	.26	.86	.70
Region						
1	.86*	.62*	---	---	.78*	---
2	.78	.55	.52	.29	.88	.81
3	.90	.59*	---	---	.79	.71*
4	.77	.53	.42	.18	.83	.62
5	.75	.53	---	.71*	.90	.83*
6	.96*	---	---	---	.91*	---
9	.78	.58	.52*	.15*	.92	.76
SMSA						
Chicago	.82	.56	---	---	.88	.77*
Jersey City	.81	.53	.65*	.20*	.96	.70
Los Angeles	.71	.42	.54*	.21*	.88	.61
Miami	.75	.54	.34	.21	.80	.53
Newark	.76	.53	---	---	.93*	---
New York	.81	.59	.67	.44	.89	.82

Table 11-D. Weeks Worked and Earnings in 1969 for Indians, by Region and Sex

Area	Proportion who worked 48-52 weeks		Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500 worked			
			Less than 48 weeks		48-52 weeks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.63	.44	.40	.18	.76	.58
Region						
1	.64	.31	---	.24*	.85*	---
2	.66	.50	.52*	.25*	.82	.74
3	.71	.54	.58*	.12*	.80	.66
4	.67	.44	.22	.16	.61	.33
5	.72	.45	.52	.20	.82	.64
6	.64	.49	.29	.12	.75	.52
7	.68	.32	.50*	.14*	.74	.59*
8	.54	.41	.25	.17	.71	.61
9	.61	.46	.48	.26	.79	.62
10	.51	.32	.56	.19	.80	.74

Table 11-E. Weeks Worked and Earnings in 1969 for Japanese, by Region, SMSA and Sex

Area	Proportion who worked 48-52 weeks		Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500 worked			
			Less than 48 weeks		48-52 weeks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.85	.63	.52	.32	.81	.72
Region						
1	.80*	.48	---	---	.71	---
2	.83	.62	.62*	.20*	.92	.79
3	.88	.47	---	.25*	1.00*	.72*
4	.80	.54	---	---	.83*	.38*
5	.80	.58	.45*	.29	.89	.81
6	.79	.68	---	---	.77*	.78*
7	.69	.35*	---	---	.53*	---
8	.72	.59	---	.32*	.77	.53
9	.85	.66	.54	.35	.81	.72
10	.78	.54	.52*	.37	.67	.68
SMSA						
Boston	.62*	.47	---	---	---	---
Chicago	.80	.59	---	.37*	.78	.81
Denver	.77*	.57*	---	---	.80*	---
Honolulu	.88	.72	.56	.31	.90	.74
Los Angeles	.84	.62	.45	.38	.74	.79
New York	.73	.59	---	.87*	.93	.67*
San Diego	.82*	.32*	---	---	.72*	---
San Francisco	.81	.63	.52*	.32	.80	.70
San Jose	.83	.57	---	---	.82	.78
Seattle	.78	.60	---	---	.84	.78*
Wash., D.C.	.71*	.58*	---	---	---	---

Table 11-F. Weeks Worked and Earnings in 1969 for Chinese, By Region, SMSA and Sex

Area	Proportion who worked 48-52 weeks		Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500 worked			
			Less than 48 weeks		48-52 weeks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.71	.55	.39	.31	.78	.65
Region						
1	.60	.39	.30*	.41*	.67	.47*
2	.67	.55	.42	.34	.80	.65
3	.76	.57	---	.42*	.85	.57
4	.79	.44	---	---	65	---
5	.65	.46	.40*	.36	.78	.73
6	.69	.58*	---	---	.65	---
7	.62	.60*	---	---	.76*	---
8	.64*	---	---	---	.59*	---
9	.76	.56	.40	.28	.79	.67
10	.61	.62	.47*	---	.65	.70*
SMSA						
Boston	.64	.49	.38*	.29*	.63	.50*
Chicago	.74	.61	.48*	.40*	.78	.64
Honolulu	.86	.70	.48*	.26	.88	.84
Los Angeles	.75	.50	.35	.26	.80	.58
New York	.76	.58	.41	.38	.73	.66
San Francisco	.74	.60	.41	.22	.77	.66
San Jose	.75	.42*	---	---	.76	---
Seattle	.64*	.52*	---	---	.76*	---
Wash., D.C.	.85	.52	---	---	.91*	---

Table 11-G. Weeks Worked and Earnings in 1969 for Filipinos by Region. SMSA and Sex

Area	Proportion who worked 48-52 weeks		Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500 worked			
			Less than 48 weeks		48-52 weeks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.76	.51	.48	.36	.87	.75
Region						
1	.76	.60*	---	---	---	---
2	.77	.45	.44*	.55	.81	.80
3	.83	.51	---	.38*	.86	.72
4	.78	.53*	---	---	---	---
5	.74	.54	.67*	.44	.88	.86
9	.75	.54	.46	.27	.89	.72
10	.78	.32	---	.24*	.81	---
SMSA						
Chicago	.70	.66	.54*	.25*	.92	.90
Honolulu	.90	.62	.60	.13	.90	.63
Los Angeles	.76	.40	.48	.46	.92	.87
New York	.66	.67	.75	---	.92	.94
San Diego	.84	.52*	---	---	---	---
San Francisco	.72	.57	.51	.28	.84	.82
Seattle	.74	.65*	---	---	.94	---

Table 11-H. Weeks Worked and Earnings in 1969 for Blacks, by Region, SMSA and Sex

Area	Proportion who worked 48-52 weeks		Proportion with earnings of more than $3,500 worked			
			Less than 48 weeks		48-52 weeks	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States	.76	.54	.46	.28	.79	.52
Region						
1	.83	.52	---	.50*	.98	.64
2	.79	.61	.67	.41	.89	.78
3	.82	.62	.40	.30	.84	.58
4	.71	.50	.34	.20	.64	.28
5	.78	.54	.60	.34	.88	.66
6	.73	.53	.38	.17	.73	.30
7	.83	.53	---	.25	.77	.64
9	.74	.49	.59	.36	.90	.68
SMSA						
Chicago	.78	.61	.74	.47	.94	.75
Dallas	.76	.55	---	---	.82	.44*
Detroit	.69	.57	.70	.42	.92	.69
Los Angeles	.73	.60	.56*	.48*	.84	.69
Miami	.78	.50	---	---	.68*	.50*
Newark	.74	.60	.76*	.47*	.89	.68
New York	.82	.66	.64	.48	.90	.79
Philadelphia	.68	.54	.68	.29	.86	.62
San Francisco	.61	.52	---	.35*	.97	.65*
Wash., D.C.	.81	.70	.55*	.39*	.88	.72

Table 12-A. Employment of Mexicans in Selected Industries, Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970*

Sex and area	All employed		Percent employed in					
	No.	Pct.	Agric., forestry	Const.	Mfg.	Trade	Prof. services	Pub. adm.
Male								
United States	8501	100.0	12.5	12.1	29.4	16.6	5.5	5.8
Region								
5	662	100.0	3.0	5.9	63.4	11.3	3.2	1.2
6	3114	100.0	12.5	16.1	17.5	19.5	6.7	8.4
7	115	100.0	4.3	4.3	39.1	13.9	5.2	4.3
8	252	100.0	12.7	9.9	28.2	11.9	7.1	9.9
9	4070	100.0	13.4	10.8	32.8	15.8	4.7	4.4
10	108	100.0	41.7	5.6	25.9	9.3	3.7	2.8
SMSA								
Anaheim	196	100.0	7.1	18.4	34.2	15.3	5.1	6.1
Brownsville	349	100.0	23.8	9.5	11.7	23.8	7.2	4.3
Chicago	365	100.0	.8	2.7	59.2	13.2	3.8	2.5
Corpus Christi	185	100.0	7.6	21.6	12.4	21.6	5.9	11.4
Dallas	124	100.0	6.5	22.6	25.8	18.5	4.0	3.2
El Paso	284	100.0	3.2	18.3	25.0	21.1	4.6	12.0
Fresno	149	100.0	49.0	3.4	20.1	11.4	4.0	2.0
Houston	299	100.0	2.0	17.1	28.8	20.7	3.7	3.7
Laredo	291	100.0	27.5	13.4	6.9	15.5	7.6	4.8
Los Angeles	1717	100.0	2.6	10.5	43.6	18.1	3.9	3.0
Oxnard	112	100.0	28.6	11.6	24.1	18.8	3.6	5.4
Phoenix	171	100.0	22.2	11.7	20.5	22.8	2.9	6.4
San Antonio	483	100.0	1.9	17.2	15.9	19.7	6.6	21.5
San Bernardino	271	100.0	17.0	9.2	23.6	18.8	7.0	7.0
San Diego	170	100.0	13.5	17.6	15.3	18.8	2.9	9.4
San Francisco	252	100.0	6.3	10.3	35.3	14.7	6.3	5.6
San Jose	203	100.0	3.4	14.8	39.4	15.3	5.9	5.9
Tucson	109	100.0	5.5	17.4	6.4	18.3	6.4	8.3
Female								
United States	6286	100.0	8.3	.7	27.3	22.7	16.6	3.1
Region								
5	411	100.0	1.9	.7	47.0	17.8	15.8	1.5
6	2222	100.0	6.9	.8	18.3	24.9	18.8	4.5
8	158	100.0	2.5	.6	17.1	29.7	19.6	2.5
9	3170	100.0	9.9	.6	32.2	21.2	14.7	2.3

Table 12-A. Continued

SMSA								
Anaheim	138	100.0	4.3	1.4	34.8	23.9	14.5	2.9
Brownsville	349	100.0	18.0	.7	13.2	31.2	20.7	1.0
Chicago	204	100.0	.5	---	63.2	13.7	9.8	1.5
Corpus Christi	185	100.0	2.0	---	8.8	24.5	18.6	2.9
El Paso	284	100.0	---	.4	33.7	22.5	19.0	3.5
Fresno	121	100.0	34.7	---	14.9	23.1	15.7	---
Houston	205	100.0	2.0	2.4	19.0	29.3	22.0	.5
Laredo	291	100.0	11.3	.5	3.2	33.3	23.7	4.3
Los Angeles	1379	100.0	1.2	.3	46.6	18.2	11.5	2.5
Phoenix	171	100.0	10.0	1.7	33.3	16.7	20.0	2.5
San Antonio	377	100.0	1.6	1.1	18.6	27.9	21.5	8.2
San Bernardino	202	100.0	11.4	---	25.2	21.3	18.8	4.0
San Diego	170	100.0	7.8	1.9	18.8	23.4	10.4	5.8
San Francisco	192	100.0	4.2	1.0	24.5	22.4	16.1	4.2
San Jose	162	100.0	6.2	.6	46.9	14.2	11.7	1.2
Tucson	109	100.0	---	---	16.4	41.1	21.9	---

---

*Regions and SMSA's with 100 or more persons

Table 12-B. Employment of Puerto Ricans in Selected Industries, Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970[*]

Sex and area	All employed No.	All employed Pct.	Percent employed in Agric., forestry	Const.	Mfg.	Trade	Prof. services	Pub. adm.
Male								
United States	2702	100.0	2.2	4.2	41.7	18.7	6.1	3.9
Region								
1	119	100.0	4.2	7.6	56.3	13.4	3.4	2.5
2	1968	100.0	1.4	3.6	38.0	20.4	6.6	4.2
3	101	100.0	5.9	7.9	45.5	16.8	5.0	4.0
5	284	100.0	1.4	1.8	71.5	12.0	3.2	1.1
9	132	100.0	5.3	9.8	31.8	12.1	6.1	7.6
SMSA								
Chicago	191	100.0	---	2.1	71.7	10.5	1.0	1.6
New York	1626	100.0	.6	3.1	32.8	22.3	9.0	4.2
Female								
United States	1882	100.0	.6	.5	49.1	14.8	16.0	3.3
Region								
2	1344	100.0	.3	.5	51.2	13.3	16.5	3.2
5	172	100.0	---	---	59.9	19.2	9.3	1.7
9	111	100.0	1.8	---	32.4	18.9	13.5	3.6
SMSA								
Chicago	113	100.0	---	---	73.5	11.5	8.0	1.8
New York	1087	100.0	.1	.3	50.8	12.1	16.5	1.5

---

[*] Regions and SMSA's with 100 or more persons

Table 12-C. Employment of Cubans in Selected Industries, Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970*

Sex and area	No.	Pct.	Percent employed in Agric., forestry	Const.	Mfg.	Trade	Prof. services	Pub. adm.
Male								
United States	1323	100.0	1.2	6.9	34.5	22.0	9.4	2.3
Region								
2	397	100.0	---	4.3	37.5	20.4	9.8	1.8
4	613	100.0	1.8	10.8	30.7	24.5	7.3	2.1
9	129	100.0	3.1	1.6	39.5	17.1	8.5	2.3
SMSA								
Jersey City	101	100.0	---	4.0	57.4	12.9	5.0	---
Los Angeles	107	100.0	1.9	1.9	43.0	22.4	4.7	1.9
Miami	539	100.0	2.2	9.5	30.6	25.4	8.3	.7
New York	240	100.0	---	5.4	22.5	29.6	8.8	2.1
Female								
United States	1193	100.0	.4	.3	50.1	15.2	13.5	1.1
Region								
2	342	100.0	---	---	55.3	9.4	14.9	1.2
4	571	100.0	.7	.4	50.1	19.4	9.5	.5
9	105	100.0	---	1.0	49.5	9.5	15.2	1.9
SMSA								
Miami	515	100.0	.8	1.0	50.5	15.5	11.1	.4
New York	205	100.0	---	---	46.8	14.6	20.0	1.0

---

*Regions and SMSA's with 100 or more persons

Table 12-D. Employment of Indians in Selected Industries, by Region and Sex, 1970*

Sex and area	All employed No.	All employed Pct.	Agric., forestry, mining	Const.	Mfg.	Trans., Communic.	Trade finance	Business, repair, personal, and recrea. ser.	Prof. ser.	Pub. adm.
Male										
United States	2690	100.0	14.2	14.6	25.2	8.4	11.8	6.1	9.9	9.9
Region										
2	126	100.0	5.6	19.0	25.4	12.7	18.3	7.2	6.3	5.6
3	79	100.0	3.8	22.8	26.6	2.5	16.5	5.1	12.7	10.1
4	246	100.0	22.8	22.0	26.8	3.3	10.6	4.4	7.7	2.4
5	302	100.0	3.7	10.6	43.0	7.9	12.3	4.9	11.3	6.3
6	638	100.0	14.4	17.9	20.5	9.7	13.0	4.5	8.9	11.0
7	98	100.0	8.2	15.3	29.6	12.2	12.2	5.1	12.2	5.1
8	279	100.0	24.3	14.7	12.9	7.2	6.5	6.5	11.5	16.5
9	621	100.0	13.8	10.5	23.5	8.9	12.9	9.0	10.8	10.6
10	256	100.0	19.5	8.6	26.6	9.4	8.2	5.8	8.6	13.3
Female										
United States	2247	100.0	4.8	0.6	21.1	2.4	21.7	15.3	27.7	6.6
Region										
2	91	100.0	3.3	1.1	19.8	2.2	19.8	17.6	29.7	6.6
3	77	100.0	2.6	2.6	22.1	2.6	18.2	13.0	23.4	15.6
4	220	100.0	10.9	0.9	38.2	0.9	16.8	9.6	20.0	2.7
5	255	100.0	3.1	0.0	28.2	2.0	18.0	14.5	22.0	3.5
6	526	100.0	2.7	0.6	21.9	1.9	28.1	15.9	28.5	5.5
7	76	100.0	1.3	0.0	18.4	1.3	25.0	17.1	27.6	9.2
8	233	100.0	4.7	0.9	9.4	3.0	17.6	13.3	40.3	10.7
9	515	100.0	4.9	0.0	15.5	2.1	22.7	20.6	27.2	7.0
10	217	100.0	7.8	1.4	19.8	5.1	10.5	10.2	27.2	8.3

*Regions with 100 or more persons

Table 12-E. Employment of Japanese in Selected Industries, Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970*

Sex and area	All employed No.	All employed Pct.	Percent employed in Agric., forestry	Const.	Trade	Mfg.	Prof. services	Pub. adm.
Male								
United States	2820	100.0	10.5	8.8	20.0	16.5	13.7	10.5
Region								
2	123	100.0	1.6	1.6	28.5	20.3	21.1	3.3
5	178	100.0	.6	2.8	21.3	28.7	24.2	2.2
9	2164	100.0	11.1	10.3	20.2	15.4	11.1	11.7
10	136	100.0	18.4	3.7	19.1	14.0	16.9	8.1
SMSA								
Chicago	131	100.0	2.3	.8	16.8	31.3	16.0	2.3
Honolulu	1121	100.0	4.8	16.1	18.3	13.7	9.6	15.0
Los Angeles	542	100.0	15.1	1.5	29.0	22.1	11.6	4.4
San Francisco	173	100.0	13.3	2.9	23.1	13.3	17.9	12.1
Female								
United States	3039	100.0	2.6	1.1	23.8	15.3	28.2	6.4
Region								
2	129	100.0	.8	---	23.3	24.0	20.9	7.0
5	185	100.0	1.1	.5	22.7	21.6	31.9	2.7
9	2226	100.0	2.8	1.3	23.8	13.5	28.8	6.8
10	158	100.0	4.4	---	23.4	15.8	22.8	5.7
SMSA								
Chicago	121	100.0	.8	---	18.2	27.3	31.4	2.5
Honolulu	1079	100.0	1.8	2.0	28.9	9.9	25.1	9.0
Los Angeles	467	100.0	1.5	1.3	21.4	19.7	27.2	4.5
San Francisco	187	100.0	3.2	.5	21.4	8.6	25.7	7.0

---

*Regions and SMSA's with 100 or more persons

Table 12-F. Employment of Chinese in Selected Industries, Regions and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970*

Sex and area	All employed		Percent employed in				
	No.	Pct.	Const.	Mfg.	Trade	Prof. services	Pub. adm.
Male							
United States	2422	100.0	4.5	14.3	33.4	18.7	8.3
Region							
2	502	100.0	2.4	13.9	39.6	15.9	3.4
5	216	100.0	4.2	19.9	25.5	36.6	2.8
9	1244	100.0	5.7	13.7	45.8	13.7	11.8
SMSA							
Chicago	105	100.0	2.9	12.4	46.7	21.9	1.0
Honolulu	268	100.0	7.8	11.2	14.6	14.2	20.5
Los Angeles	239	100.0	3.8	20.5	33.5	18.4	4.2
New York	424	100.0	.9	12.3	45.0	10.1	5.0
San Francisco	486	100.0	2.5	9.9	43.2	13.2	8.0
Female							
United States	1765	100.0	.7	22.2	21.4	28.3	5.2
Region							
2	309	100.0	.3	38.8	16.5	20.7	1.9
5	150	100.0	.7	18.0	17.3	46.0	.2
9	1008	100.0	.7	20.0	23.0	25.4	3.7
SMSA							
Honolulu	229	100.0	.4	7.4	27.1	28.4	13.1
Los Angeles	160	100.0	1.9	28.1	25.0	26.3	1.9
New York	268	100.0	---	45.5	14.2	15.3	1.9
San Francisco	402	100.0	.7	22.6	24.4	21.1	7.7

---

* Regions and SMSA's with 100 or more persons

Table 12-G. Employment of Filipinos in Selected Industries, Regions, and SMSA's, by Sex, 1970[*]

Sex and area	All employed		Percent employed in					
	No.	Pct.	Agric., forestry	Const.	Trade	Mfg.	Prof. services	Pub. adm.
Male								
United States	1480	100.0	12.8	6.5	20.5	14.5	16.0	8.8
Region								
2	88	100.0	1.1	2.3	15.9	15.9	35.2	8.0
3	60	100.0	---	1.7	15.0	8.3	50.0	5.0
5	102	100.0	---	5.9	29.4	7.8	34.3	3.9
9	1088	100.0	16.5	7.7	19.6	15.7	9.5	10.1
10	66	100.0	12.1	1.5	33.3	13.6	18.2	3.0
SMSA								
Chicago	77	100.0	1.3	1.3	29.9	5.2	40.3	2.6
Honolulu	464	100.0	20.9	17.0	17.9	11.9	3.9	9.9
Los Angeles	146	100.0	.7	4.1	28.8	25.3	12.3	5.5
New York	61	100.0	---	1.6	18.0	13.1	26.2	9.8
San Francisco	204	100.0	4.9	2.0	16.2	10.8	17.6	16.2
Female								
United States	1306	100.0	3.3	.3	13.9	17.2	38.4	4.6
Region								
2	126	100.0	---	---	9.5	6.3	50.8	8.7
3	108	100.0	---	.9	7.4	8.3	60.2	6.5
5	140	100.0	.7	---	10.7	10.7	68.6	1.4
9	755	100.0	4.9	.4	16.6	20.9	26.8	4.5
10	62	100.0	6.5	---	21.0	24.2	24.2	3.2
SMSA								
Chicago	119	100.0	---	---	5.0	6.7	72.3	---
Honolulu	283	100.0	6.4	.7	15.2	28.6	16.6	4.6
Los Angeles	140	100.0	---	---	20.7	12.9	37.1	2.1
New York	60	100.0	---	---	10.0	8.3	55.0	6.7
San Francisco	198	100.0	1.0	---	7.6	14.6	31.3	6.6

[*] Regions and SMSA's with 100 or more persons

Table 12-H. Employment of Blacks in Selected Industries by Region, SMSA and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	All employed No.	All employed Pct.	Percent employed in Agric., forestry	Const-ruction	Mfg.	Trade	Prof. Ser.	Public Adm.
Male								
United States	3880	100.0	5.7	10.5	32.8	14.1	9.2	7.1
Region								
1	64	100.0	---	7.8	37.5	15.6	12.5	14.1
2	510	100.0	.8	7.6	29.0	16.3	10.0	5.9
3	583	100.0	3.3	12.2	29.7	13.4	9.6	13.2
4	1132	100.0	14.0	12.5	28.9	12.1	10.0	4.1
5	734	100.0	.5	7.1	49.7	12.1	7.6	6.3
6	467	100.0	5.6	14.6	27.8	19.7	6.6	4.7
7	104	100.0	5.8	2.9	36.5	14.4	8.7	12.5
9	261	100.0	2.3	9.6	22.6	15.7	10.7	11.5
SMSA								
Chicago	211	100.0	.5	4.3	39.3	14.7	7.1	14.7
Detroit	157	100.0	---	5.7	56.7	8.3	3.8	3.9
Los Angeles	316	100.0	.7	8.8	29.4	19.9	8.1	9.3
Newark	80	100.0	2.5	5.0	27.5	20.0	8.8	4.7
New York	305	100.0	.7	6.9	16.7	19.3	8.2	18.6
Philadelphia	164	100.0	1.2	17.1	31.1	11.0	12.8	7.8
San Francisco	62	100.0	1.6	9.7	25.8	9.7	4.8	8.5
Wash., D.C.	147	100.0	2.0	13.6	4.8	20.4	13.6	30.2
Female								
United States	4011	100.0	3.4	.3	17.4	12.1	27.1	5.5
Region								
1	82	100.0	---	1.2	22.0	2.5	29.3	1.2
2	504	100.0	.8	.2	22.6	12.7	30.4	4.6
3	626	100.0	1.3	.5	15.3	14.0	29.4	10.9
4	1154	100.0	9.0	.3	18.0	23.0	23.0	1.6
5	701	100.0	.4	.3	18.4	21.4	27.7	9.0
6	508	100.0	3.0	.4	10.4	15.2	26.0	3.7
7	130	100.0	1.5	---	16.9	4.3	26.2	6.9
9	275	100.0	.7	---	20.0	6.2	31.3	6.5
SMSA								
Chicago	239	100.0	.4	.8	24.7	22.2	23.0	7.5
Dallas	58	100.0	1.7	---	19.0	24.1	22.4	---
Detroit	124	100.0	---	.8	21.8	21.0	28.2	1.6
Los Angeles	143	100.0	.7	---	24.5	14.7	25.9	7.7
Newark	83	100.0	1.2	---	37.3	14.5	18.1	3.6

Table 12-H. Continued

New York	352	100.0	---	---	16.8	15.3	27.6	5.4
Philadelphia	168	100.0	.6	---	16.1	13.7	35.1	8.9
San Francisco	52	100.0	---	---	9.6	11.5	32.7	13.5
Wash., D.C.	154	100.0	.6	---	3.9	14.3	26.6	23.4

APPENDIX A

Definitions and Explanations

Source of Data

Information in this report was derived from the Public Use Sample (PUS) records from the 1970 census. Every Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) of 250,000 or more population in 1970 was identified as a subarea, except in New England and Hawaii. In New England where SMSA's cross county lines, the SMSA's are approximated in terms of entire counties. In Hawaii, the city of Honolulu and the remainder of the state are identified as the SMSA.

Sample Populations

Spanish origin, Oriental, American Indian and black persons were selected for this report. Among these groups, persons were included if they were between 20 and 64 years of age, not enrolled in school and not living in group quarters. Three Spanish populations were identified on the basis of descent, rather than surname, whereas the other populations were identified on the basis of race codes. With these specifications, the sampling fractions for each population were:

Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban	1%
Japanese, Chinese, Filipino	2%
Indian	2%
Black	1%

The numbers in each of the sample populations, shown in Appendix B, Table 4, constituted the starting point for estimates of population values. The number of persons in the labor force tends to be less than the total in a population, and the number employed less than the number in the labor force. Consequently, estimated numbers of persons differ within a population depending on the item of information involved.

Reliability of Estimates

In general, the reliability of estimates in this report is influenced by two types of errors--sampling and nonsampling. Errors attributable to sampling were not estimated primarily because of technical complexities and costs in time and money. Evaluation of a statistic and comparisons of different estimates would require a number of tests. Each of a pair of estimates, for example, might reasonably represent a population value, but the difference between the pair of estimates might not be statistically significant.

Estimates of sampling errors, such as the standard error, measure the precision of a sample estimate relative to a census count but they do not indicate possible inaccuracies in a census attributable to nonreporting, errors in coding or errors in processing. Such nonsampling errors are generally less important than sampling errors for estimates of relatively small proportions of a population.

In the absence of specific estimates of reliability, readers are cautioned that unknown sampling and nonsampling errors are present. An arbitrary strategy was devised in the presentation of estimates. First, in the case of dichotomous variables (e.g., labor force participation and employment), estimates are not shown if the base frequency was less than 15. Estimates are marked with an asterisk (*), if the base frequency was between 15 and 30. Second, for continuous variables (e.g., occupation scores and earnings), estimates based on a frequency of less than 10 were deleted. Estimates based on very low frequencies are therefore either deleted or marked with an asterisk as a precaution against unwarranted inferences. While this procedure is less rigorous than specific tests of significance, it is designed to help avoid estimates based on low sample frequencies.

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's)

A standard metropolitan statistical area is a county or group of contiguous counties which contains at least one city of 50,000 population or more, or a pair of cities with a combined population of at least 50,000. In addition to the county or counties containing such cities contiguous counties are included in an SMSA if they are socially and economically integrated with the central city. In the New England area, SMSA's consist of towns and cities instead of counties.

SMSA's were selected for this report primarily on the basis of the number of persons in the labor force in one or more minority populations. Since sample data were employed, the majority of all SMSA's had too few persons, other than whites and blacks, to justify detailed tabulations. Some of the selected SMSA's contained adequate sample frequencies for no more than one minority whereas other SMSA's could be represented by two or more minorities.

As a matter of saving space, tables indicate only the first city name in instances of SMSA's containing two or more cities. The accompanying alphabetical list of SMSA's shows each city represented by an SMSA.

ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS IN THIS REPORT

Albuquerque, N. M.
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Graden Grove, Calif.
Baltimore. Md.
Boston, Mass.
Buffalo, N. Y.
Chicago, Ill.
Corpus Christi, Texas
Dallas, Texas
Denver, Colorado
Detroit, Mich.
El Paso, Texas
Fayetteville, N. C.
Fort Smith, Ark.
Fresno, Calif.
Honolulu, Hawaii
Houston, Texas
Jersey City, N. J.
Laredo, Texas
Lawton, Okla.
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.
Miami, Florida
Milwaukee, Wisc.
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.
New York, N. Y.
Newark, N. J.
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.
Oklahoma City, Okla.
Oxnard-Ventura, Calif.
Philadelphia, Pa.
Phoenix, Ariz.
Portland, Ore.-Wash.
Sacramento, Calif.
San Antonio, Texas
San Bernandino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.
San Diego, Calif.
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.
San Jose, Calif.

Santa Barbera, Calif.
Seattle-Everett, Washington
Stockton, Calif.
Tacoma, Wash.
Tuscon, Ariz.
Tulsa, Okla.
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.

DOL REGIONS

1. Connecticut
   Maine
   Massachusetts
   New Hampshire
   Rhode Island
   Vermont

2. New Jersey
   New York
   Puerto Rico*
   Virgin Islands*

3. Delaware
   District of Columbia
   Maryland
   Pennsylvania
   Virginia
   West Virginia

4. Alabama
   Florida
   Georgia
   Kentucky
   Mississippi
   North Carolina
   South Carolina
   Tennessee

5. Illinois
   Indiana
   Michigan
   Minnestoa
   Ohio
   Wisconsin

6. Arkansas
   Louisiana
   New Mexico
   Oklahoma
   Texas

7. Iowa
   Kansas
   Missouri
   Nebraska

8. Colorado
   Montana
   North Dakota
   South Dakota
   Utah
   Wyoming

9. American Samoa*
   Arizona
   California
   Guam*
   Hawaii
   Nevada

10. Alaska
    Idaho
    Oregon
    Washington

Education

Level of educational attainment is indicated by the number of years of school completed. Persons enrolled in school in 1970 were not included in the sample data for this report.

Labor Force Participation

Persons in the labor force (ILF) were either employed or unemployed during the calendar week prior to the data on which respondents completed their questionnaires or were interviewed during the 1970 census enumeration.

Employed persons comprise all civilians either at work or with a job but not at work. Persons excluded from the employed are those whose only activity consisted of work around the house or volunteer work.

Unemployed persons are civilians not employed during the reference week who were looking for work within the previous four weeks and were available to accept a job. Also included are persons who were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off.

Persons not in the labor force (NILF) include housewives, retired workers, seasonal workers and persons doing only incidental unpaid family work. Students and inmates of institutions were excluded from the sample data.

Labor Force Participation Rates

A labor force participation rate (LFPR) represents the proportion of a population classed as in the civilian labor force. The LFPR for males 20-34 years of age, for example, is the proportion of men at those ages classified as in the labor force.

An employment rate (ER) is the proportion of persons in the labor force who were employed; and similarly, an unemployment rate (UR) is the proportion of persons in the labor force who were classed as unemployed.

Weeks Worked in 1969

Data on weeks worked pertain to the number of weeks during 1969 in which a person did any work for pay or profit or worked without pay on a family farm or in a family business. Weeks of active service in the armed forces are also included.

Occupation

The system of occupation classification for the 1970 census consisted of 441 specific occupation categories arranged into 12 major occupation groups. For purposes of this report the major occupation groups were modified by combining service workers and private household service workers into a single service workers category. Also, operatives were combined with transportation equipment operatives and farm managers with farm laborers. Tabulations thus show only 9 major occupation groups in this report.

Industry

The 1970 industry classification system developed for the census consisted of 227 categories classed into 12 major industry groups. Estimates are shown for industries employing relatively large numbers.

Occupation Scores

Occupation scores were constructed for this study based on 203 occupations derived by collapsing the original census list of 441 occupations. On a 100-point scale these scores represent an employed worker's level of occupational achievement. (For a detailed description of the scoring procedures see Appendix A in Minorities in the Labor Market, Vol. I or II, by G. L. Wilber, et al).

Occupational Mobility

Estimates of occupational mobility are based on the detailed list of 441 occupations and the occupation scores calculated as of 1970. Occupation scores were assigned to individuals employed in 1965 and 1970. Mobile workers are those whose occupation scores differed for the two years. If a worker's occupation score was higher in 1970 than in 1965, mobility was classed as upward, and if a score was lower in 1970, mobility was downward. Stayers had the same occupation score for both years, although they may have shifted to a different occupational category.

Earnings

Earnings from wages or salaries represent money received for work performed as an employee at any time during the calendar year of 1969. It includes wages, salary, commissions, tips, piece-rate payments, pay from the armed forces and cash bonuses earned. Median earnings are based on individual persons with earnings in 1969. Types of income not defined as earnings includes social security or railroad retirement income, public assistance income and income from such sources as interest, dividends, rent, veterans' payments, public or private pensions, unemployment insurance benefits, workmen's compensation case benefits, and net royalties.

The percent of employed persons who earned $3,500 or more in 1969 serves as a summary indicator of income differences within and between populations.

Appendix B

Appendix Table 1. Selected Characteristics of SMSA's With 200,000 Population or More and Concentrations of Spanish, Orientals and Indians, 1970

SMSA	Total pop. (000's)	Pct. of SMSA pop. in central cities	Pct. of central city pop. white	Per capita income, 1969	Percent of total work force unemployed
Albuquerque	316	77.2	95.7	$3135	5.3
Anaheim	1420	31.4	96.3	4141	5.9
Baltimore	2071	43.7	53.0	3856	4.0
Boston	2754	25.1	81.8	4281	4.3
Buffalo	1349	34.3	78.7	3822	5.4
Chicago	6979	48.2	65.6	4678	3.6
Corpus Christi	285	71.8	93.7	2959	4.8
Dallas	1556	54.3	74.2	4052	2.8
Denver	1228	41.9	89.0	3889	3.3
Detroit	4200	36.0	55.5	4677	6.7
El Paso	359	89.7	96.4	2895	4.9
Fayetteville, N.C.	212	25.2	61.1	3190	---*
Fresno	413	40.2	86.7	3407	6.5
Honolulu	629	51.6	33.9	4356	3.5
Houston	1985	62.1	73.4	3674	2.6
Jersey City	609	42.8	77.8	4278	6.6
Los Angeles	7032	45.1	78.8	4728	5.8
Miami	1268	26.4	76.6	4054	4.4
Milwaukee	1404	51.1	84.4	4215	4.2
Minneapolis	1814	41.0	94.3	4419	3.4
New York	11529	68.2	76.6	5055	4.1
Newark	1857	20.6	44.0	4755	4.9
Okl. City	641	57.2	83.9	3472	3.5
Oxnard	376	33.7	93.2	3086	6.4
Philadelphia	4818	40.4	65.6	4028	4.2
Phoenix	968	60.1	93.3	3498	4.1
Portland	1009	37.9	92.2	3964	5.6
Sacramento	801	31.8	81.5	3565	5.8
San Antonio	864	75.7	91.4	3028	4.8
San Bernandino	1143	27.0	90.7	3126	5.9
San Diego	1358	51.3	88.9	3694	5.6
San Francisco	3110	34.6	67.3	5009	5.0
San Jose	1065	41.9	93.6	4061	5.7
Seattle	1422	41.1	88.3	4463	9.5
Tacoma	411	37.6	90.8	3518	8.7
Tucson	352	74.8	94.8	3240	3.3
Tulsa	477	69.5	86.6	3793	4.5
Wash., D.C.	2861	26.4	27.7	4359	2.6

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1972, pp. 838-897.

Appendix Table 2-A. Summary Characteristics of Mexicans in SMSA's, 1970*

SMSA	Md. ed.	LFPR		UR		Md. income		Per capita income	Pct. in poverty
		M	F	M	F	M	F		
Anaheim	9.0	84.8	41.5	5.4	10.7	$6582	$2431	$2305	13.0
Brownsville	5.1	69.6	35.1	9.1	7.8	2916	1316	982	56.7
Chicago	8.2	85.0	45.1	4.0	7.3	6578	3318	2396	12.8
Corpus Christi	6.2	74.2	31.8	5.6	7.4	3904	1553	1313	38.7
Dallas	7.4	85.3	42.4	3.5	6.1	4973	2119	1807	20.9
Denver	9.4	77.1	36.4	7.3	4.2	5407	1853	1920	20.0
Detroit	9.0	85.4	39.0	9.3	6.4	8002	2438	2846	9.3
El Paso	7.8	74.7	36.9	4.7	5.8	4384	2189	1433	30.4
Fresno	7.4	71.3	27.6	11.9	17.6	3774	1335	1291	37.0
Houston	7.4	82.6	37.4	3.0	3.8	5376	2225	1774	20.9
Laredo	6.3	69.7	31.6	7.9	6.2	2826	1344	1103	51.3
Los Angeles	9.3	80.6	40.1	6.1	8.8	6153	2628	2147	16.1
McAllen	4.5	69.8	31.2	5.3	9.2	2682	1131	1009	61.2
Oxnard	7.8	83.3	39.7	6.4	11.0	4820	1944	1815	19.5
Phoenix	8.1	80.4	40.2	5.0	6.4	4639	1954	1604	28.2
Sacramento	8.9	73.2	32.3	12.1	13.7	5179	1774	1785	20.8
San Antonio	7.2	76.2	34.2	5.3	6.9	4151	1723	1478	31.4
San Bernandino	8.6	76.9	35.6	5.5	8.8	5464	1868	1792	19.6
San Diego	9.1	81.9	34.8	6.7	8.0	4847	2152	1916	19.9
San Francisco	10.3	79.5	41.4	7.6	10.7	6968	2787	2531	14.4
San Jose	8.9	79.1	39.0	11.0	19.9	6488	2010	2054	14.6
Tucson	8.9	76.3	30.7	5.4	7.0	5282	1676	1690	23.2

PC(2)-1C, Tables 13, 15 and 16.

*SMSA's with 50,000 or more Spanish origin persons.

Appendix Table 2-B and C. Summary Characteristics of Cubans and Puerto Ricans in SMSA's, 1970

SMSA	Md. ed.	LFPR		UR		Md. income		Per capita income	Pct. in poverty
		M	F	M	F	M	F		
				Puerto Ricans					
Chicago	8.0	83.7	43.1	4.9	10.8	$5609	$3143	$1846	23.4
Jersey City	8.3	82.5	34.0	4.9	11.1	4943	3016	3816	28.9
New York	8.7	72.6	29.1	5.5	7.8	5155	2990	1741	31.4
Newark	7.8	82.0	32.2	5.2	14.2	5275	2685	1547	33.5
Philadelphia	7.9	79.2	36.1	5.3	8.0	4589	2819	1647	34.2
				Cubans					
Jersey City	8.6	90.7	63.0	6.0	11.4	5843	3270	4106	14.9
Los Angeles	11.3	83.2	52.2	8.1	9.8	6053	2735	2521	14.6
Miami	9.6	83.5	51.6	3.8	6.6	4828	2505	2297	15.7
New York	9.7	84.0	47.2	2.6	6.0	6059	3313	2946	12.9

PC(2)-1C, Tables 13, 15 and 16.

*SMSA's with 50,000 or more Spanish origin persons.

Appendix Table 2-D. Summary Characteristics of Indians in SMSA's, 1970

SMSA	Md. ed.	LFPR M	LFPR F	UR M	UR F	Md. income M	Md. income F	Per capita income	Pct. in poverty
Albuquerque	12.2	62.0	41.9	5.9	4.8	$4322	$2933	$1841	34.4
Anaheim	12.0	82.0	47.6	7.1	11.6	6323	2403	2705	13.2
Baltimore	10.0	73.3	43.6	10.5	14.2	5462	2737	2197	23.4
Buffalo	10.0	74.5	35.7	15.4	11.6	4996	1947	2008	26.7
Chicago	11.1	76.7	44.4	4.3	7.6	5896	2564	2593	17.4
Dallas	12.0	78.9	55.1	3.8	6.4	5099	2500	2302	18.1
Denver	11.9	72.5	46.5	7.3	8.9	4561	1924	1935	26.4
Detroit	10.4	80.7	46.1	9.0	10.5	6910	2424	2897	14.1
Fayetteville, N.C.	9.8	81.2	43.2	7.8	14.6	3235	2174	1378	33.4
Fort Smith	9.0	53.8	33.5	10.5	10.2	2549	1624	1212	51.3
Houston	10.3	82.6	39.8	2.3	5.1	6009	1866	2731	24.4
Lanton	12.0	59.2	36.3	12.0	20.7	3382	1221	1347	32.1
Los Angeles	11.8	74.5	43.8	8.7	8.2	5690	2582	2434	19.3
Milwaukee	10.8	81.6	46.8	10.7	7.0	5929	2155	2093	20.6
Minneapolis	11.4	70.9	41.9	9.7	9.3	5366	2143	1751	27.5
New York	11.2	73.4	48.1	5.4	7.5	5359	3030	2893	17.9
Okla. City	12.2	75.5	46.6	4.2	4.5	5082	2621	2160	20.9
Philadelphia	10.5	78.8	43.8	5.4	5.3	5876	2248	2539	17.0
Phoenix	9.6	62.2	38.7	4.7	8.7	3116	1508	1302	44.5
Portland	11.7	75.9	45.3	17.7	15.4	4917	1957	2241	18.9
Sacramento	11.5	72.4	33.8	13.2	6.9	4287	1874	2150	21.8
San Bernandino	11.1	70.3	31.3	7.1	8.2	5117	1972	2190	25.9
San Diego	11.6	81.5	43.6	7.5	11.3	2854	1934	2240	21.4
San Francisco	12.1	72.4	45.4	9.1	10.7	6175	2674	2651	20.6
San Jose	12.2	76.9	40.4	8.1	13.9	7015	2348	2597	12.6
Seattle	11.1	67.4	35.6	18.0	16.0	5439	2024	2071	23.8
Tacoma	10.9	73.7	35.2	20.6	19.5	3117	1828	1851	27.3
Tucson	7.0	48.0	19.7	11.1	7.6	1838	1214	844	62.6
Tulsa	12.0	73.6	40.9	6.1	7.9	5266	1893	2329	18.7
Wash., D.C.	12.6	87.6	64.4	3.0	4.0	7058	4791	4112	12.1

PC(2)-1F, Tables 11, 13 and 14.

*SMSA's with 2,500 or more Indian population.

Appendix Table 2-E. Summary Characteristics of Japanese in SMSA's, 1970*

SMSA	Md. ed.	LFPR		UR		Md. income		Per capita income	Pct. in poverty
		M	F	M	F	M	F		
Anaheim	12.8	89.0	43.1	2.5	1.4	$9739	$3353	$3800	4.7
Chicago	12.7	83.3	49.7	2.0	1.6	8573	3915	4101	6.6
Denver	12.5	80.1	49.5	2.1	2.0	7702	3010	3413	7.5
Fresno	12.5	73.0	41.8	.3	6.5	5671	1949	3098	11.2
Honolulu	12.3	80.9	58.4	1.5	1.9	8252	3788	3895	4.2
Los Angeles	12.7	81.8	53.3	2.3	2.4	7890	3582	3880	6.7
New York	13.3	81.3	36.7	2.7	3.5	8339	3962	4582	9.8
Sacramento	12.6	76.8	46.8	1.9	2.3	7003	2753	3435	6.8
San Diego	12.3	80.9	34.2	3.6	6.5	6939	2438	2350	11.2
San Francisco	12.7	79.4	52.1	2.7	2.4	7709	3687	3829	7.9
San Jose	12.8	81.9	50.4	2.7	2.0	9084	3076	3979	6.3
Seattle	12.6	79.5	51.6	2.6	4.5	7859	3105	3854	6.7

PC(2)-1G, Tables 11, 13, 14

*SMSA's with 5,000 or more Japanese.

Appendix Table 2-F. Summary Characteristics of Chinese in SMSA's, 1970*

SMSA	Md. ed.	LFPR		UR		Md. income		Per capita income	Pct. in poverty
		M	F	M	F	M	F		
Boston	11.7	72.7	54.9	2.8	4.4	$3823	$2468	$2580	16.8
Chicago	12.3	74.8	50.9	2.5	2.6	5101	3012	3022	11.5
Honolulu	12.4	76.0	54.7	2.1	1.7	8114	3632	4001	6.3
Los Angeles	12.8	77.2	51.4	3.9	3.2	5916	2883	3243	12.2
New York	9.8	71.2	49.8	2.4	2.8	4352	3143	2655	16.3
Sacramento	12.2	69.7	44.5	2.1	11.1	5417	1808	2845	13.7
San Francisco	12.0	71.8	54.0	4.4	3.8	5269	2575	3000	13.2
San Jose	15.8	79.3	45.8	3.6	6.1	8761	2000	3964	10.6
Seattle	12.3	71.9	49.6	3.8	6.9	5215	2806	3019	10.0
Wash., D.C.	14.5	77.0	49.5	1.4	3.8	6312	2774	3711	11.6

PC(2)-1G, Tables 26, 28 and 29.

*SMSA's with 5,000 or more Chinese.

Appendix Table 2-G. Summary Characteristics of Filipinos in SMSA's, 1970*

SMSA	Md. ed.	LFPR		UR		Md. income		Per capita income	Pct. in poverty
		M	F	M	F	M	F		
Chicago	16.5	86.2	78.8	2.8	1.2	$6389	$5361	$4064	12.0
Honolulu	9.8	79.4	49.0	3.1	4.7	5654	3034	2484	11.2
Los Angeles	12.9	81.4	63.1	4.9	3.5	5448	4152	3086	12.1
New York	16.1	76.9	72.7	3.5	1.6	6124	5950	4352	12.5
Norfolk	12.6	95.2	31.3	2.7	8.9	3082	3269	1834	23.1
Salinas	11.4	81.2	56.9	4.9	9.7	4681	2674	2350	12.6
San Diego	12.3	85.0	39.6	7.4	6.9	4252	2790	1970	21.5
San Francisco	12.4	76.4	58.7	6.7	4.2	5486	3635	2719	10.8
San Jose	12.3	76.9	59.4	5.3	8.9	5761	4078	2947	8.1
Seattle	12.1	74.4	56.1	13.3	7.8	5286	3234	2968	11.5
Stockton	7.1	70.2	47.3	5.1	14.5	2918	2298	2222	19.4
Wash., D.C.	14.7	84.1	67.7	2.1	4.1	5997	4880	3740	9.0

PC(2)-1G, Tables 41, 43 and

*SMSA's with 5,000 or more Filipino population.

Appendix Table 3-A, B and C. Selected Characteristics of Spanish Origin Persons, United States and States with 100,000 or More Spanish Origin Persons, 1970

State	Median years school completed, 16 and over		Median earnings, employed, 16 and over		Per capita income	Pct. unemployed 16 and over	
	M	F	M	F		M	F
			Mexican				
U.S.	9.4	9.1	$5702	$2833	$1716	6.1	8.9
Arizona	9.3	9.0	5610	2441	1592	5.7	6.6
California	10.0	9.8	6350	3157	1976	7.1	10.7
Colorado	10.0	9.8	5718	2554	1672	8.0	9.7
Illinois	8.8	9.0	6672	3532	2370	4.1	7.2
Michigan	9.6	9.9	7626	3339	4189	9.1	7.9
New Mexico	10.6	10.7	4975	2369	1391	5.6	9.8
Texas	8.1	7.7	4616	2408	1312	5.1	6.8
			Puerto Rican				
U.S.	9.7	9.3	5675	3539	1794	5.6	8.7
California	11.1	11.1	6556	3736	2317	8.8	11.3
Florida	9.7	10.9	4910	3207	2069	3.3	6.4
Illinois	8.7	8.7	5552	3226	1865	4.9	11.1
New Jersey	8.8	8.6	5558	3067	1743	5.7	11.2
New York	9.7	9.2	5606	3716	1735	5.5	7.9
Pennsylvania	8.9	8.9	5174	3126	1615	5.4	5.4
			Cuban				
U.S.	11.5	10.4	6431	3444	2617	4.3	7.3
California	12.1	11.2	6635	3703	2543	8.3	10.3
Florida	11.1	10.1	5682	3018	2347	4.1	6.4
New Jersey	9.9	8.8	6350	3420	2655	5.0	10.8
New York	11.1	9.9	6908	4093	2955	2.5	5.8

PC(2)-1C, Tables 6, 7, and 10.

Appendix Table 3-D. Selected Characteristics of Indians, United States and States with 10,000 or More Indian Population, 1970

State	Median years school completed, 16 and over		Median income, 16 and over		Per capita income	Pct. civilian labor force unemployed	
	M	F	M	F		M	F
			American Indian				
U.S.	10.4	10.5	$3509	$1697	$1573	11.6	10.2
Alaska		*	3424	1365	1728	23.5	16.3
Arizona	9.1	8.9	2247	1283	867	11.7	8.2
California	11.6	11.6	4989	2076	2249	11.8	11.0
Illinois		*	5749	2455	2514	4.7	7.7
Michigan		*	5000	1995	2164	13.9	13.2
Minnesota		*	3486	1829	1397	17.0	11.2
Montana	10.2	10.2	2494	1141	1196	19.5	17.3
New Mexico	9.4	9.3	2529	1385	983	13.1	8.1
New York	10.7	10.9	5177	2409	2383	10.0	8.7
North Carolina	8.9	9.7	3141	1819	1227	3.4	9.5
North Dakota		*	2287	1751	1016	28.5	12.6
Oklahoma	10.7	10.8	3254	1633	1614	8.2	9.3
Oregon		*	4322	1640	1829	17.1	12.9
South Dakota	9.7	10.1	1743	1461	976	26.3	12.9
Texas		*	4565	1961	2251	4.5	6.5
Utah		*	2849	1285	955	10.8	12.5
Wash., D.C.	11.0	10.9	3822	1569	1763	21.7	18.2
Wisconsin		*	3952	1688	1497	15.9	9.7

PC(2)-1F, Tables 4 and 5

*Not available.

Appendix Table 3-E, F and G. Selected Characteristics of Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos, United States and States with 10,000 or more Japanese, Chinese and Filipinos, 1970

State	Median years school completed, 16 and over		Median income 16 and over		Per capita income	Pct. civilian labor force unemployed	
	M	F	M	F		M	F
			Japanese				
U.S.	12.6	12.4	$7574	$3236	$3602	2.0	3.0
California	12.8	12.6	7746	3247	3672	2.4	2.8
Hawaii	12.3	12.3	7839	3623	3797	1.4	2.1
Illinois	12.9	12.6	8194	3587	3881	2.4	2.3
New York	15.3	12.7	7959	3569	4285	2.6	4.4
Washington	12.8	12.5	7474	2702	3459	2.8	5.1
			Chinese				
U.S.	12.6	12.3	5223	2686	3122	3.0	3.7
California	12.7	12.3	5512	2505	3110	4.0	4.7
Hawaii	12.5	12.4	8000	3594	3967	2.1	1.8
Illinois	12.8	12.4	4783	2821	2942	2.7	2.5
Massachusetts	12.4	12.3	3901	2371	2607	2.6	4.0
New York	11.7	11.2	4361	3078	2722	2.3	2.9
			Filipino				
U.S.	11.9	12.6	5019	3513	2790	4.7	4.7
California	11.9	12.6	4698	3469	2635	6.2	5.9
Hawaii	9.0	11.5	5252	2826	2369	2.8	4.8
Illinois	15.6	16.6	6332	5154	4023	2.8	1.8
New York	14.3	16.3	6259	5731	4302	3.3	1.6
Washington	11.3	12.4	5007	2907	2682	13.2	8.9

PC(2)-1G, Tables 5, 6, 9, 19, 20, 34, 35 and 39

Appendix Table 4. Sample Populations, By Region and Sex, 1970

Sex and area	One percent samples			Two percent samples			
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Indian	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino
Male							
United States	8858	2918	1356	3079	2974	2616	1843
Region							
1	11	124	28	50	26	103	43
2	61	2129	406	138	127	528	96
3	51	107	40	88	50	109	131
4	84	86	630	288	40	70	59
5	679	289	71	329	184	235	107
6	3252	23	27	737	38	78	22
7	125	4	12	115	31	53	17
8	274	5	3	321	72	32	16
9	4207	144	133	733	2259	1327	1264
10	114	7	6	280	147	81	88
Female							
United States	9784	3471	1622	3424	3958	2325	1649
Region							
1	12	123	30	54	59	71	29
2	69	2657	462	136	201	454	151
3	58	125	51	107	120	114	129
4	77	97	785	311	105	59	55
5	601	279	85	350	281	190	155
6	3821	24	27	864	79	49	28
7	138	8	10	113	51	31	36
8	248	6	5	369	109	21	10
9	4658	143	156	835	2753	1279	979
10	102	9	11	285	200	57	77